THEOLOGY on THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGY

lighten our own labours. To a great extent Turoroov has been

Montbly Zournal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVII OCTOBER, 1928

THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH

numerous, including as they do a number of devotional addresses

Wartburg. The Conference was a secret to that hald leve.

though there hat we MAINOTICISM to abbreviate.

is important, of course, to remember that these conference office of all bounds of Our 100th Number Dipologist visite ora

THEOLOGY reaches this month its 100th number—a sufficient milestone, perhaps, to justify us in pausing for a moment, if not of retrospect, at least of thanks. Thanks, first, to that solid body of subscribers whose support has enabled our average monthly circulation to increase, even though sometimes to only a small extent, each year. Our readers are not the less helpers because many of them are unknown. Thanks, next, to all those who have contributed more directly by their own pens to the development of the Journal. A large proportion of our articles, and almost all our reviews and notices, are contributed gratis; and the same is true of the Notes on Periodicals and other occasional matter appearing in Miscellanea. There is nothing we should welcome more than such an increase in circulation as would enable us to remunerate our contributors more adequately. We are obliged, also, to other theological papers in many parts of the world for their exchange copies, and for the attention they have given to what appears in THEOLOGY. Finally, we desire to express our particular gratitude to two constant and unwearying collaborators, our publishers and our printers. Readers of Theology know how generously Dr. Lowther Clarke has placed his deep and detailed learning at their disposal; what they cannot know is the way in which his counsel and sympathy have been available for the Editor, and how often he has found the solution of some perplexing problem. Equally happy have been our relations with our printers, Messrs. Billing of Guildford, whose punctuality and accuracy have done much to XVII. 100

lighten our own labours. To a great extent Theology has been a matter of team work; and we trust that the experience gained already may be the prelude to still further fruitfulness for the Journal in the future.

amount of the south of the contraction

We publish today the papers of the Second Conference of German and English theologians held last August at the Wartburg. The Conference was a sequel to that held last year at Canterbury, the proceedings of which were published in THEOLOGY in May, 1927. On this occasion the papers are more numerous, including as they do a number of devotional addresses; though these last we have been compelled to abbreviate. It is important, of course, to remember that these conferences are strictly theological and not part of any immediate policy of ecclesiastical Reunion; and if the place given to Luther in some of the German contributions—notably in Dr. Reichardt's sermon—should seem to our readers somewhat disproportionate, it should be borne in mind that the conference was held at a spot sacred above all others to the memory of the great German reformer. This having been said, we warmly commend these papers to our readers' perusal. They represent a remarkable collection and classification of the materials provided by the New Testament for a Christology and of some of the chief modern attempts to handle them in Germany and in England. Our only regret is that the papers cannot be accompanied by a gramophone record of the discussions. By a happy coincidence, Dr. Mozley's review of the new volume of Trinitarian and Christological essays which Dr. Rawlinson has edited falls due for publication in this number. It should also be added that ur cordial thanks are due to Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Dr. Rawlinson for translating and revising several of the German papers; to the Rev. L. Patterson, D.D., for translating some of the "Meditations"; and to our colleague in Germany, Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt, editor of Theologische Blätter, which is publishing the parallel German edition of the proceedings oid were the word to and to the well associated with the proceedings of the west of the proceedings of the procedure of the procedure

and sympathy have been available for the liditor, and how often ac has found the solution of some perploxing problem. Squally happy have been our relations with our printers. Mossrs. Billing of Guildford, whose purectuality and accuracy have done much to

Conference of German and English Theologians held at the Wartburg, August 11-18, 1928

SUBJECT: CHRISTOLOGY

second agricult cross theological	mas responsible for the
2901 St of Il taugua to CONTENT	
Introductory Notes noursell han !	4. 美国的大型,在1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年,1912年
" SOUBIBIEDO TETH BUT TOURSENOUS	Prof. D. Karl Ludwig Schmidt,
I. What is Christology des ods -Teer .	Prof. D. Adolf Deissmann, D.D.,
ox. 1927, No. 5: Theologische Blätter,	Berlin, and Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D., Reading
II. 1. Christology in Contemporary Theo-	
logy in Great Britain 2. Christology in Contemporary Ger-	Prof. J. M. Creed, Cambridge
2. Christology in Contemporary German Protestantism	Prof. D. Dr. Heinrich Frick,
3. Note on Contemporary Theology	to visievinil edt neluh
mossolori Sweden been M. L. moni	Prof. D. Gustaf Aulen, Lund
III. Primitive Christology and its Signifi-	T (Sweden) (subindme)
cance for the Present	University of Merlin; Pro-
1. Ιησούς δ διδάσκαλος και προφητής	Prof. D. Gerhard Kittel, Tübin-
e; Professor Dr. Gerhard Kittel, the	gen, Rev. C. H. Dodd, M.A., Oxford, and Prof. Nathaniel
the Rev. Professor Nathaniel Mick-	Michlem, D.D., Kingston
2. Ιησούς Χριστός Θεού νέδς σωτήρ	Prof. D. Karl Ludwig Schmidt,
St. Augustine's House, Regular	Jena, and Rev. Sir Edwyn
inson, D.D., Christ Church, Oxford;	Hoskyns, Bart., M.A., Cam-
un Saint the University of dense	Prof. D. Gustaf Aulen, Lund, and
	Prof. D. Paul Althaus,
Her: Professor Dr. Wilhelm Vollrath.	Pastor Lic. Hermann Sasse, Berlin,
eichardt. Landesobernfarter of the	and Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson,
1015: Marára lás airelli. A cigainn	Prof. D. Dr. W. Vollrath,
IV. Reflections on the Course of the Con-	muines assurang out la
meastonference, etcill to etutional minte	
V. 1. Inaugural Sermon on Heb xiii. 7 -	Rev. D. Reichardt, Eisenach,
1 2. Meditation on St. Matt. xxii. 42-46 -	Chief Pastor in Thuringia
3. Meditation on St. Matt. ix. 35-38	Prof. D. Paul Althaus, Erlangen Prof. D. Karl Ludwig Schmidt,
4. Meditation on St. John vi. 60-69	Jena , see et s
5. Meditation on 1 Cor. i. 21-25	Prof. D. Gerhard Kittel, Tubingen Prof. D. Dr. H. Frick, Giessen
6. Closing Meditation on Phil. ii. 5-11	Archbishop Nathan Soderblom
	D.D., Upsala

INTRODUCTORY NOTES

BY PROFESSOR D. KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

THE Commission for cecumenical co-operation between theologians, appointed by the 1925 Stockholm World Conference, was responsible for the second British-German theological conference held at the Wartburg from August 11 to 18, 1928. In addition to the British and German theologians there was present also a Swedish theologian. The first conference was held at Canterbury in April, 1927, the subject being the "Kingdom of God" (see Theology, 1927, No. 5; Theologische Blätter, 1927, No. 5). The subject chosen for this year was "Christology." There was little change in the personnel of the conference. Those who took part this year were Professor Dr. Paul Althaus, the University of Erlangen; Professor Dr. Gustaf Aulén, the University of Lund; the Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury; the Rev. Canon J. M. Creed, Ely Professor, Cambridge University; Professor Dr. Adolf Deissmann, the University of Berlin; Professor Dr. Heinrich Frick, the University of Giessen; the Rev. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bt., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Professor Dr. Gerhard Kittel, the University of Tübingen; the Rev. Professor Nathaniel Micklem, D.D., Queen's Theol. College, Kingston (Canada); the Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D., St. Augustine's House, Reading; the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Christ Church, Oxford; Pastor Lic. Theol. Hermann Sasse, Oranienburg, near Berlin; Professor Dr. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, the University of Jena, Editor of Theologische Blätter; Professor Dr. Wilhelm Vollrath, the University of Erlangen. The following also attended as guests: Dr. Wilhelm Reichardt, Landesoberpfarrer of the Evangelical Church of Thuringia; Dr. Martin Saupe, director of the preachers' seminary at Eisenach; Pastor Dr. Paul le Seur, director of the Hainstein Institute at Eisenach; Professor Dr. Nathan Söderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, Sweden. Professor Deissmann, as chairman of the Stockholm Theological Commission, directed the conference, which was held in the Wartburg Hotel. The inaugural sermon, which was delivered by Dr. Reichardt on the text Heb. xiii. 7, and the daily meditations, which were held at 8 a.m., took place in the chapel of the Wartburg Castle. The texts of the daily meditations were chosen with especial reference to the subject of the conference; Althaus (Matt. xxii. 42-46), Schmidt (Matt. ix. 35-38), Kittel (John vi. 60-69), Frick (1 Cor. i. 21-25), the Archbishop of Upsala (Phil. ii. 5-11).

The five preliminary papers were read first: "The Nature of Christology" (Deissmann, Mozley), "The Present Christological Position in Germany" (Frick), in England (Creed), in Sweden (Aulén). Then followed the papers on Primitive Christology and its importance for the present day; "Jesus as Prophet and Teacher' (Kittel, Micklem, who also read Professor Dodd's paper, Professor Dodd being absent owing to illness), "The Ichthys Formula: Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour" (Schmidt, Hoskyns), "The Crucified" (Althaus, Aulén), "Maranatha" (Vollrath). The last afternoon was devoted to the consideration of a survey of the whole discussion drawn up by Dr. Frick, assisted by the Dean of Canterbury. As was the case with the first conference, the papers are printed in German in the October number of Theologische Blätter, and this year to the papers is added various other material appertaining to the conference. The present number of Theology therefore corresponds closely with the October number of Theologische Blätter. It was decided during the course of 1929 to publish a collection of essays on "Christology," the book to appear simultaneously in German and English, and it was also decided that the conference should meet again in England in 1930aut beverios

The division of opinion in the conference was by no means a division in which the English stood on one side and the Germans on the other. Differing points of view were expressed among the English theologians as among the Germans. This was especially the case with Professor Micklem, who raised with great clarity questions familiar to the German theologians brought up in the liberal school, whereas, on the other hand, the positive Christological and ecclesiastical position upheld by some of the Anglicans closely approximated to the position of some of the Germans. The discussion between the Anglicans and the Lutherans centred upon the value of the formulæ of the Early Church and upon the importance of Luther's Christological utterances. For the details the reader should refer to the papers and the surveys of the discussion. It was a good sign of the intensity of the discussion and of its value that on both sides the desire was expressed that it should be continued on

some other occasion. It is proposed that the subject for the next conference be "The Presence of Jesus Christ in Word and Sacrament." The members of the conference were all conscious of their responsibility to the authorities of their own Church, and were therefore grateful for the good wishes both of the Archbishop of Canterbury and of Dr. Kappler, President of the German Evangelical Church.

In the midst of strenuous discussion, protracted often until late in the night, but broken fortunately by the relaxation afforded by admirable meals, time was found for other lighter enjoyments. On the first Sunday evening Dr. Reichardt received the conference at supper in his most beautiful house overlooking the city of Eisenach, and explained the difficulties which had faced the Thuringian Church as a result of the revolution. A visit was made to the home of the German Youth Movement, and a whole afternoon was given up to an expedition to Weimar. The conference was received in Weimar by Herr Steer on behalf of the Thuringian Government, and visited the Goethe National Museum and the city church, where the director of the museum and Pastor of the Church explained the treasures with the care of which they had been entrusted. The happy relations of the conference with the authorities in the Church and State of Thuringia were continued at the dinner given by Professor and Frau Deissmann in the Wartburg Hotel on the Thursday evening, at which Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, speaking in German in a happy after-dinner speech, conveyed the thanks of the conference to Dr. Reichardt, to the Governor of the Wartburg, to the Burgermaster of the city, and to all those others who had combined to give the conference such charming hospitality in a place so full of historical memories. The Archbishop gave his judgment upon the importance of the conference by saying: "When the Wartburg comes to Canterbury and Canterbury goes to the Wartburg, then there begins a new epoch in the history of the Church and a new period of theological thought." A similar opinion was recently expressed by Dr. Zoellner, General Superintendent in Westphalia, who, writing in the Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchenzeitung (1928, No. 30), said: "The best and most thorough continuation hitherto of the work of the Lausanne Conference appears to have been achieved in the well-known conversations between Germans and British at Canterbury." a monoment off to wire metal out lo

sides the desire was expressed that it should be continued on

son (c) It can only therefore be enterprised (engraphed) and

-I. WHAT IS CHRISTOLOGY?

THESES FOR THE WARTBURG CONFERENCE, AUGUST 11-18, 1928 By ADOLF DEISSMANN

1. Christology as a department of theological science has both an historical and a normative task to perform. It is concerned on the one hand with deeply significant facts of the spiritual history of the past, on the other with the great practical problem of the "norm" of Christianity alike for the individual and for the Church of to-day.

2. Christology as an historical science has the task of elucidating by reference to the sources the following particular

questions:

(a) The origin and development of the Messianic idea and of the Messianic hope both inside and outside Israel and Judaism.

(b) The Messianic consciousness of Jesus of Nazareth.

(c) The origin and nature of the original apostolic Christcult and the forms in which it found expression.

(d) The origin and development of the Christian doctrine

of Jesus Christ ("Christology" in the narrower sense).

3. This "Christology" in the narrower sense can only be rightly understood historically when it is primarily estimated

- as a reflection of Christolatry.

 4. Though there is a sense in which the facts even of historical Christology in their deepest and finest significance can be disclosed only to the investigator who is himself "apprehended by Christ," there are wide areas in which the problems with which it is concerned are susceptible of solution by means of a purely secular historical science and in afromatica and to enumero manon
- 5. Christology as a normative science answers the questions:
- (a) Of our personal attitude to-day towards Jesus Christ. (b) Of the nature and justification of the Christ-cult in the Church of to-day.

(c) Of the content and method of the present-day preaching

of Christ.

6. Of Christology, considered as a mode of thought which would lay down "norms," the following propositions are true:

(a) It has not the character of a secular science which must

be accepted by every man without more ado.

(b) It is in the main rather an esoteric function of the "Christ-cult"; it is its self-conscious expression, its selfjustification, its self-purification. stulgade adt to docider out so

(c) It can only, therefore, be enterprised (angegriffen) and comprehended (begriffen) by men who are themselves apprehended " (ergriffen) by Christ. THESES FOR THE WARTBURG CONFERENCE, AUGUST 11-18, 1928

2. WHAT IS CHRISTOLOGY Pand).

Commence of the state of the st

both an historical and real restriction of the perform. It is supported on the erre had been been been facts of the

LET us start with the complaint which Harnack, more than a quarter of a century ago, made in his lectures entitled What is Christianity?: "Christology," he says, "is treated as though the Gospel had no other problem to offer"; and to this attitude of mind he traces much fanaticism in the past and still persistent. In so far as what he said was true in 1900 it is true in 1928. A casual glance at any theologian's bookshelves will show that there is no sign of abatement of serious interest in the Christological problem; popular religious literature and the columns of our newspapers point to the fascination which the story of Jesus exercises in circles where theological and ecclesiastical debates make but little appeal. And yet the fact of this fascination is, perhaps, the nearest and most certain approach to the Christological problem. Such fascination as that is the door to far-reaching questions and answers. It opens on to the "why?" of Christology, and it is well to see why Christology should exist before we ask what is the essence, the truth, of Christology.

That a wonderful fact needs interpreting is one simple answer to the question "Why." An understanding of the nature of the Christian religion enables us to give two other answers.

First, Christianity, from the earliest moment when in the consciousness of its adherents, though not yet called by the name "Christian," it was conceived of as a distinctive and unique religious way, presented itself as absolute religion. But the absoluteness of a religion means the supremacy of the religious ideal, as divine revelation prior to human aspiration, there and there only. This supremacy was never dissociable from the Person of Christ, when once His disciples were reborn into a new world through faith in His resurrection. That led straight on to the conviction that there was no other name given under heaven, except this name, the name of Jesus, the risen and exalted Lord, whereby men must be saved. It is very curious how little Troeltsch has to say about the Person of Jesus in that lecture of his on "The place of Christianity among the world-religions," which represents his last thoughts on the subject of the absolute validity of Christianity. I would suggest that no really intelligible, let alone adequate, answer to any question on that subject can be given apart from a Christology. Ritschl, on the other hand, shows his sense of the importance of this connection by opening his discussion of "The Doctrine of Christ's Person and Life-Work" with the sentence: "The nature of Christianity as a universal religion is such that in the Christian view of the world a definite place is assigned to its historical founder" (Ritschl's italics). The pages which follow strengthen the force of these words.

Secondly, the internal richness of the Christian religion, in respect of its characteristic experiences, institutions, developments of character, and special heroisms, is so bound up with the Person of Christ that, logically precedent to any judgment of value directed towards them, there must be a judgment of value directed towards Him. All this combined religious wealth, which can hardly be regarded as merely accessory to the Gospel, does, in fact, raise one problem, and that the Christological. After all, the History of Dogma, as Harnack wrote it, was very largely the History of Christology. And the history of anything specifically Christian would be very largely a history of such derivations from Christ and movements towards the expression of Him, the Pauline "fulfilment" of Him in the manifold life of the world, as would by the pressure of its own immanent logic bring the Christological problem into the middle of the foreground in) to some as and lo ylastrothin a

The Christological problem is, then, unavoidable. But not every answer to the problem gives us what can rightly be called a Christology. Thus, when Mr. H. G. Wood, the commentator on St. Mark's Gospel in Peake's Commentary, says in his controversial writing. Why Mr. Bertrand Russell is not a Christian, that a Christian regards Jesus Christ as the best and wisest of men," he is expressing a form of belief about Jesus which has a place in Christology, but is so far from being by itself a Christology, that if that had been all which the first members of the Christian Church had believed, there would be now neither Christians nor Christology. From a very different angle Christology is evacuated of its true content when the relation between Jesus and God is regarded as typical or illus God. Hegelian idealism has been a great misleader. When, to take a British example, Pringle-Pattison, in his Gifford Lectures on The Idea of God, remarks that "We are far too apt to limit and mechanize the great doctrine of the Incarnation which forms the centre of the Christian faith, and, later, protests against of the incarnation of the Son being limited to a single historical individual, he gives a moderate example of a tendency which, when carried to an extreme among the Italian Neo-idealists, gives us what may be called, though with Von Hügel I should say wrongly, a doctrine of incarnation but is certainly not a doctrine of the Person of Christ, not a of "The Doctrine of Christ's Person and Lile-Workygolotsird?

On the following points I would lay stress as of the essence of Christology: First, Christology is the judgment of what the historical Jesus, teaching, suffering, dying, risen, and exalted, is for faith as regards God and the world. Secondly, Christology is both a value-judgment and an ontology. Ritschl's positive method remains, in this matter, as a real help to the theologian; but it is impossible to stop where he stopped. Judgments of value and judgments of being are inseparable. And from the side of apologetics an ontological Christology is necessary las ian επιτείχισμα, to iluse hAthanasius invordu in appreciation of the anti-Arian value of the Homogusion An ontological Christology is a great and indispensable safeguard against a depreciation of the currency of value judgments. Finally, at the centre of the historic Christology of the Christian Church has been the affirmation of the Godhead of Jesus Christ. That fact as simply a fact of history does not of itself make that affirmation indispensable. But it is not an unreasonable presumption, in the whole context of the inner self-development and expansion outwards of the Christian religion, that what is historically of the essence of Christology is ideally so also. of The Christological problem is, then anavoidable But

called a Christology. Thus, when Mr. H. G. Wood, the com-H.-1. CHRISTOLOGY IN CONTEMPORARY

not every answer to the problem gives us what can rightly be

and wisest of men, days of men a properson of property of the contract of the

Jesus which has a place in Christology, but is so far from being THE present position of Christological doctrine in Great Britain demands reference to our theological history and send mem

1. In the nineteenth century we were deeply influenced by German theology. But no considerable school in Britain whole-heartedly assimilated the position of any of the great systematic theologians of Germany. Nor Ididawe produced an great systematic theologian of our own own English are to take a British example, Pringlesquescriptamataya il a ton

2. Looking yet further back, in the sixteenth century we were deeply influenced in turn by Luther, Zwingh, and Calving but we carried out our Reformation in appiecemeal fashion which is a perpetual bewilderment to foreigners and even to ourselves. Scotland, of course, is different in The result is that no great reformer has been classical and normative to us, in the way in which Luther has been to Germany. The Reformed English Church was from early days remarkable for its appeal to antiquity. The great Anglican theologians of the seventeenth century have played a far greater part in the traditions of English theology than the roughly corresponding school of Calixtus in the subsequent history of the Lutheran Church.

This helps to explain the important place which the controversies of the Patristic Age and the conciliar decisions still occupy in our treatment of Christology. To some influential theologians among us the conciliar decisions with their terminology are all but sacrosanct. Thus Bishop Gore writes in his latest work, Reconstruction of Belief (new edition, October, 1926): "There is, I feel convinced, no necessity why we should discard the venerable terminology of the Councils if I add until we have a better! I shall not be speaking in entire sincerity, for I do not believe the better will be forthcoming." Needless to say, this is not typical of all British theology. North of the Tweed and in the English Free Churches the Fathers are in less esteem. And in the Church of England Modernists and Evangelicals are ready to underline Article XXI.: "General Councils rue. bromay err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God. But even where ecclesiastical tradition carries little weight, Patristic study often provides the starting-point for the development of Christological doctrine Dr. Rashdall, for instance, always maintained the essential identity of his interpretation of the Incarnation of the Logos in the man Jesus with the affirmations of the Councils. Another illustration of the influence of the Patristic tradition is afforded by Dr. Raven, diwhowhas confessed (Apollinarianism, 1923, Preface) -- to the amazement of Dr. Loofs -- that he began his studies of Apollinarianism as lat believer in the impersonal humanity of our Lordow Lt. was donly, he says, sasthe investigation continued, that the evidence forced me to the conviction that Apollinarianism both in its ancient and its modern in the process of the world, finds personal "saldenatru raw Imrof

This preoccupation with Patristic Christology not unnaturally exposes us to the temptation of looking for modern ideas in ancient doctrines, where they are not really to be found. Thus I think that Dr. Raven's sympathetic treatment of Theodore of Mopsuestia is in some points open to criticism of this kind. So, on the other wing, Dr. Relton (A Study in Christology, 1917), who believes that the doctrine of Enhypostasia as formulated by Leontius of Byzantium will, with a certain element of re-interpretation, meet our problems of

today: under the head of modern re-interpretation Dr. Relton introduces the idea that the humanity of Christ, which unlike ours was perfect, pre-existed in God. This particular "modernism" seems quite incompatible with the presuppositions alike

of Chalcedon and of Leontius ralg avad vantues dinestueves ent The obvious difficulty encountered by the traditional Christology in face of the evidence of the Gospels as to the human limitations of Jesus of Nazareth has been widely met in Great Britain, as it was at one time in Germany, by a Kenotic Christology. This type of teaching appears not to have struck root among us until the later years of the nineteenth century. It has been championed by Anglican and by Free Church divines. It was affirmed with emphasis upon the ethical value of the idea by Dr. Mackintosh in his weighty work on The Person of Christ (1912); it is still cautiously maintained by Dr. Gore, the chief Anglican exponent of the doctrine, and it is sympathetically regarded by Dr. Sydney Cave (the Congregationalist Divine) in his recent book, The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ (1925) odd deiniel dle ib beiggt ten ei eidt vas of seellee!

But on the whole this type of Christology is probably less

influential than it was dorred out in had ameete sent in ou Thus it is severely criticized by Dr. Temple in Christus Veritas (1924): the idea that the Eternal Word surrendered divine attributes and cosmic functions at the Incarnation involves intolerable difficulties. Dr. Temple finds essential truths enshrined in the Chalcedonian Christology, but he thinks that an antithesis of Nature and Will, already presupposed by Paul of Samosata and by those who condemned him, raises inevitable difficulties in the traditional Christology when judged from a modern standpoint. lo consultui suit lo montantant

Dr. Bethune-Baker has in the past subscribed to a Kenotic Christology, but in recent Essays he has definitely moved away from that position. He is today chiefly concerned to adapt Christological doctrine to the frame-work of an evolutionary philosophy. God and man at all stages in evolution mutually imply each other. The Divine purpose the Logos immanent in the process of the world, finds personal embodiment in Jesus

the Christ (The Way of Modernism and other Essays, 1927)."

Much recent Christology—both learned and popular—seems to be conditioned by a reaction from the traditional conception of God. The Kenotic Christology was concerned to show how Jesus Christ, limited as he was in knowledge and power, could yet be thought of as the Second Person of the Trinity, incarnate. The present tendency is to approach the problem from the other end. We know little or nothing of God except as we know Him in Jesus Christ is the measure of our knowledge of God. The traditional theology, it is said, went astray through starting from the attributes of God as omnipotent, omniscient, and impassible; a truly Christian theology should take its start from Jesus Christ and look for God through and in Him alone.

This method of approach allies itself at times with a modern form of Patripassianism: God is revealed in Christ as being Himself a finite and a suffering God. In popular teaching this idea appears to have received an impetus from the experiences of the war. This current tendency called forth in 1926 a valuable study in the history of the idea of "impassibility" as ascribed to God by Dr. Mozley. Dr. Mozley himself holds that the doctrine of God's impassibility embodies a truth which a sound theology must seek to retain. In the same year as Dr. Mozley's book (1926) there appeared a collection of papers and addresses by Baron Von Hügel, among which is an Essay on Suffering and God. Von Hügel finds an incompatibility between Patri-passianism and the conception of God implied in the Synoptic Gospels. He also detects a weakness from the ethical standpoint in the present popular doctrine which attributes suffering to God. The needs of religion are met by the affirmations: God sympathizes, Christ suffers. The Chalcedonian formula of the two natures, whatever may be the difficulties in its detailed application, safeguards the theological verity, that suffering is not experienced by God Himself. morit vantaes disposionin times one is apoleona decisionil.

2. CHRISTOLOGY IN CONTEMPORARY GERMAN PROTESTANTISM

By D. DR. HEINRICH FRICK

I. PRELUDE

1. To supplement the following lines the reader may refer to two recent publications: The Transactions of the Erster deutscher Theologentag zu Eisenach, 1927 (published by Deutsche Theologie, Göttingen, 1928), and R. Paulus, Die Christusfrage in der Gegenwart, 1922. We are following the terminology of Paulus by using the name of "Jesus" for the historical personality Jesus of Nazareth, the human element in Jesus Christ, and the title of "Christ" for the supra-historical, divine element in Him.

2. In modern art there may be observed the man Jesus of Nazareth as well as the symbolical interpretation of the idea of Christ; the former being influenced by the question of the "historical Jesus," the latter depending on the traditional type of ecclesiastical pictures. Since about 1900 the conception XVII 1900

of the man "Jesus" has often grown to that of a superhuman being (prophet, ecstatic, etc., especially by the so-called "expressionists"); the idea of Christ has sometimes been interpreted in a gnostic way as a "higher spiritual being" (R. Steiner). A someth is the lies it soll a denorage to boutten sid!

So the extreme ends of the line are marked by a simple human being and by a super-human spirit. Corresponding with these two types, the modern interest in Jesus Christ outside of the Church has usually applied to Him two groups of titles: either religious genius, social revolutionary, ethical teacher

or some impersonal idea (e.g., the poets).

3. In the midst, between those extreme standpoints, nearer to each other, are to be found the common types of lay Christology within the Church; on one side He is acknowledged to have been the most perfect man, primus inter pares, usually in a moral sense; on the other side, people are acknowledging the Deity of Jesus Christ, which means in many cases emphasizing the physical miracles of virgin birth and of corporeal resurrection. The extreme standpoints (ebionitism and gnosticism) are avoided; but nevertheless the difference between the two lines is deeply felt. more and off another and anidagery about

(Probably the first meaning depends historically on the older rationalism and on the modern "quest of the historical Jesus"; whereas the second group may be derived from the Kenosis-theology of the early nineteenth century, from the pietistic revival, and from so-called biblicism.)

II. THEOLOGIANS OF TODAY

It is absolutely impossible to follow the two lines, above quoted, in describing the Christological standpoints of prominent theologians. There are several presuppositions on which they And it is only from the acknowledgment of such a common basis that discussion can begin. I mean especially two facts multiplications: The Iransperior safthe Ersterations theorew

(a) The revival of the theory of justification by faith alone,

coming down from the times of the Reformation.

(b) The results of the studies on the "historical Jesus" in the field of systematic theology. I have the lower and prise y

For Christology the first statement (a) means a twofold itse of "Christ "for the of

front, namely:

1. Towards ancient and mediæval Christology;

2. Towards modern ideas and interpretations of Jesus Christ. normann enry va beamentant ented tennal out ; tain () !

Furthermore, the statement (b) includes two assumptions, namely: 00 odt 0001 thous obies. Same i pictures to say

OOI HAX

1. That it is impossible to replace the dogma of Christ by the so-called "historical Jesus."

2. That it is necessary for Christology somehow to include the historical appearance of Jesus of Nazareth.

Maken Striben (Look, Verrede, E.H. Miliston, 63); "Hee cas Christen

glorious and comfortable Manne from the crine and work He has mine

There] are diverging judgments on the influence which the theory of justification by faith has had on Christology. These judgments depend on the relationship between the chief periods of Christology. There have been especially three periods: the early and mediæval Church, the modern period, and the time of the Reformation. We have to give attention to these points:

1. The ecclesiastical dogma offers a "higher" Christology. It treats of the inner mysteries of the Deity. Therefore Christology speaks of two natures in one person, and of the work of satisfaction. Emphasis is laid on:

(a) The determinative point of view: looking from within the Trinity; for Jesus Christ, one person with two natures, is the second person of the Godhead; that means He is Himself God. The contrasts, which the dogma treats, are those of nature-substances, timeless entities;

(b) The work depends on the person: if He were not the God-man, his work could never have had the effect of satisfaction.

2. Modern attempts to express the meaning of Jesus Christ follow an absolutely different way. There is no "high" Christology, but only modest ideas. For they try to describe how the divine revelation appeared and was made humanly perceptible in Jesus. Therefore they offer two statements: one concerning the past event of history, the other describing the eternal content of that event, effective here and now. So there is a double difference from the type 1.

(a) Thinking begins from a point of view within history. Modern times have discovered that historical fact: "Jesus of Nazareth" distinct from the dogmatic Christ. The contrasts are no more substantial, but existing between the historical event of time past and its eternal authority—i.e., between time and eternity.

(b) The "personality" of Jesus depends on his work and message. There is something, a cause, to which Jesus owes. His exceptional rôle.

3. The Christology of the Reformation may be taken from characteristic quotations of Luther and Melanchthon.

Luther (Weimarer Ausgabe 16, pp. 217 sqq.): "Thus have the sophists depicted Him—as Man and God—they number His legs and arms, and mingle miraculously His two natures—all of which is nothing but a sophistical knowledge of the Lord Christ. For Christ is not named Christ because He has two natures—what is that to me? But He bears that glorious and comfortable Name from the office and work He has taken upon Himself."

Melanchthon (Loci¹, Vorrede, Plitt's Edition, 63): "Hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia eius cognoscere, non quod isti docent, eius naturas, modos incarnationis intueri. . . ." (60). "Mysteria divinitatis rectius

adoraverimus, quam vestigaverimus."

There are two important ideas in it:

(a) "Evangelical" theology has to make a distinction between Christological mysteria and the material for study and knowledge. A background of mystery has to be acknowledged

(adorare), but not to be explored (vestigare).

(b) We have to study the Christus in carne. He can be explored because there is a story (historia) of the incarnate Christ. But it is not before the application (for me, for us) of the historia to the faith of the hearer that we begin to cognoscere beneficia Christi.

The consequences of these ideas for the present situation

of Christology differ widely from each other.

IV. FIRST THESIS: HISTORIZING CHRISTOLOGY

The statements of the Reformation belong to the same type of Christology as modern thought—the ancient dogma is sui generis. So the sentences 3 a and b from § III. have to be explained in the following way:

(a) Protestant Christology not only refuses to explore the mysteria divinitatis, it condemns on principle substance-

Christology.

(b) It has to be replaced by a new kind of Christology ("from below"); we have to look at the revelation in the historical Jesus of Nazareth. The predicate of Deity is to be developed from the basis of His historic humanity.

Schleiermacher: "Strength of his Consciousness of God."

A. Ritschl: "Fidelity in His Ethical Vocation."

W. Herrmann: "The Inner Life (Personal Character) of Jesus."

Contra—argumentation.—(a) The thesis is based on modern epistomology (especially Kant). In modern times the idea of God has become doubtful, whereas in the Reformation-time it stood fast. But if thought through and brought to its logical end, this doubt disturbs the idea of One sent by God to reveal Him. Whoever speaks of Christ's "Deity" (and Ritschl, e.g.,

does it emphatically) makes the presupposition of God's existence. So the background of a mysterious "God," who is more than Jesus, cannot be put aside without disturbing the authority of Christ. We want a "Theology" apart from "Christology."

(b) On the same way of modern thinking the historia has become doubtful. There is today a "quest of the historical Jesus," no security of knowledge. So the basis (from Schleiermacher to Herrmann: "inner life" of Jesus) has become more and more doubtful, and today the "history" cannot be regarded as a firm foundation of Christology.

V. SECOND THESIS: NEGATIVELY DOGMATIZING CHRISTOLOGY

We have to combine the Christology of dogma and that of the Reformation-time, whereas modern thinking stands aside for itself.

So § III. thesis 3 a and b have to be interpreted as follows:

(a) Substance-Christology must be cancelled. But not the dogma itself. Its statement was expressed in a formula convenient to the contemporary generation of Christians. The formula could not be avoided, but it is not absolutely necessary. We today understand the meaning of the dogma as soon as we stop the interpretation of it as a statement of facts. Instead of this method of thinking we have to take it as a dialectical expression of the Word of God. The contrast belongs to the essence of the message: the living God speaks here and now as ever. Dogma was once a testimony of this living word, afterwards the theory of "by faith alone," to-day the dialectic theology. In all these cases the human hearer is invited not to vestigare, but to listen faithfully.

(b) Therefore one is not allowed to distinguish a soteriological Christology from a general background of "Theology,"
which would be non- or pre-Christian. Theology is Christology,
and vice versa. Speaking of God means speaking of Christ—
that is, of the saving historia. This story must not be identified
with a section of human history in time and space, although
it participates in its factuality. But as God's own action
it is something else; as a parabola (running from the infinite to
the infinite) touches a circle from outside in one point only,
so our world is touched by that event. From within we see
nothing but the fact ("that"), but its "how" will always
be a mystery for us. We can explore only its influence on the
world, its negative consequences (crisis . . .).

Modern disturbances (as the problematic character of the idea of God and the question of the historical Jesus) are abolished. The first, because it does not belong to the tasks of theology

to speak of God as if He were a subject of observations and statements; the second one by the absolute distinction between faith and history (Christ=the Word of God, and the historical Jesus).

K. Barth: "Der Römerbrief?" 10 VOVI OCTUR ON (d)

F. Gogarten: "Ich glaube an den dreieinigen Gott," 1927.

E. Brunner: "Der Mittler," 1928.

R. Bultmann: "Jesus," 1927.

Argumentation against the Thesis.—(a) Suppose that the thing (the Word of God) has always been the same, changing nothing but its formula, then we want a norm (criterium) indicating which form (among different possible forms) we have to select. For at each moment of history there can be only one formula claiming to be the exact and adequate expression (the message of the hour). Furthermore the "negative" form (crisis, judgment, end, frontier of humanity) has a very distinctive "idea of God" as presupposition. Whereon is it based?

(b) It is not sufficient to look at "Christ." For the statement, that Christ is God, means either (in a synthetic way), there is something Divine that can be attributed to Christ; in this case there must be a "theology" beside Christology, which by this theological group is refused; or it means (analytically), Christ and God are synonyms; in this case the Christian point of view ought to be justified by comparison with other "theo-logies," which cannot be done without any "positive" Christology.

VI. Third Thesis: Sceptically Rationalizing Christology

In IV. and V. theology and Christology were closely connected with each other. But with a different emphasis! The "first thesis" emphasized the special phenomenon of the historic Jesus, the "second thesis" looked especially at the essence of God and His Word, using the name of "Christ" as an alternative form of "God." Both theories wish to solve the question of "God" and that of "Jesus" with one stroke. But this seems to be impossible. So we have to study now such theories as make a clear distinction between the two questions. First Albert Schweitzer must be quoted. He combines, as he says, sceptical epistemology and ethical optimism. So his ideas on Jesus Christ are as follows:

1. The historical person of Jesus stands far away from us as a strange phenomenon (He represents eschatological mysticism and ethics, and His end is a collapse).

2. The faith, by which salvation comes to us, is "Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben" (reverence for life), optimistic ethics in spite of scepticism of knowledge i.e., service for the good of all living beings without knowing its meaning. Toll drive an automoral don

3. This attitude of "nevertheless" may be described as "Reformation" as well as "early-Christian." There is some relationship in it with the "historical Jesus" even and especially with the gospels. So we have to acknowledge (a) historical dependence on that mysterious Jesus, and (b) the effectiveness on us of His picture as drawn in the New Testament. This Christology is no more disturbed by the question of "history."

Argumentation against the Thesis .- (a) Jesus may be regarded as an example, only on the assumption that the faith stands fast without any doubt. For the strange character of Jesus might become a hindrance to faith, if faith had not its own strength. There is historical reality of a frustrated life (downfall of eschatological hopes!) in the historical Jesus; might it not influence us more than the (irrational) attitude of "nevertheless"? Christology in this case depends on a strong "theo-logy."

(b) But "theo-logy" too is full of doubts. The separation between pessimistic epistemology and optimistic ethics corresponds to a darkness in God. The "life" of which A. Schweitzer speaks lacks exactness and definiteness. The being of life does not yet justify life. And "reverence" is impossible as long as we are not taught which kind of life is to be respected. The definition of a valuable life depends on the appearance of Jesus Christ. But "Christology" (cf. (a)) is said to depend on general "theo-logy." So we are running a circle. Theology itself is as doubtful as Christology at the morning of the maintain to mainten ent morn conclaing the living Word of the traing God. So the problematic

VII. FOURTH THESIS: SYNTHETIC CHRISTOLOGY

Jesus Christ can only be described as the correlation of two different elements: the "once past" (Jesus of Nazareth) and the "living now" (Christ). Both are dependent on each other, but they are not absolutely identical. We have to begin with present experience of faith, an organic unity, which may be explained afterwards (analytically) as composed of "two" elements, these elements being rightly conceived only as combined with each other, but not separated from each other (vgl. Gg. Wobbermin's "Circle of Religious Psychology"). What we are composing synthetically is only a method of thinking post eventum. Therefore we have three ideas:

1. The Necessity of a Revision of the Idea of God. - Verbum Dei in the sense of Reformation theology exists, where the exterior "word" (e.g., the Bible) is met by faith (cf. Hebrews iv. 2:

ο λόγος της ακοής . . . συνκεκερασμένος τη πίστει τοίς

akoudade). In out in 1990 for the mine event in select onsh nov

So only we are allowed to speak of the living God (actuosus not otiosus, as with the philosophers). He is spirit, and so is His word (πνεθμα), which must be heard as actually appealing to us (not as corresponding to a subject), and as a totality (e.g., collective message of a community, not isolated individualism). The ancient exegesis was "static," it should now become "dynamic." The word is not at first the name of a subject, but it means an address to us here and now and a living dialogue. (So E. Troeltsch, in his Glaubenslehre, followed the "economical" theory of the Trinity; corresponding to Luther's Catechism, where the three articles of faith are entitled as

creation, salvation, sanctification.)

2. Revision of the Idea of "History."—The theses I. to III. (§§ IV. to VI.) presuppose that the modern method of historical studies has to be accepted. But theology cannot stand for it without restriction. Formally "time" ought to be re-interpreted (cf. F. W. Schmidt, Time and Eternity, 1927). The content of history, too, claims revision. As an example I quote R. Otto, Das Heilige. Here a special character of the story of religions is worked out; the "numinous and its schematism." At last Otto comes to important sentences on Christ. God is "living," always discovered anew by the founders of religion; Jesus is sui generis ("the Son"), because He alone is not only discoverer of the holy, but "subject of divination"-i.e., His foundation and He, the founder, are identical.

3. Sketch of Synthetic Christology.—(a) We have to begin from the meaning of justification by faith alone; soteriology as teaching the living Word of the living God. So the problematic

idea of God will be overwhelmed by Pneumatology.

(b) From this standpoint the (historical) working out of the Word is to be explored. A wide circle of "general history of religions" in the sense of the idea of the holy; a special history of the prophetic-biblical message; at last a fact for itself: Jesus of Nazareth, the Holy, from the point of view of comparative history of religion a single fact. You may apply all the possible titles and terms of religion to Him, He will always be something more, for that which he founded was He Himself. So the "historical Jesus" may be understood from the point of view of topload," e'cterraudo Wash all day of general Theology.

(c) Christology in its special sense stands on (a) and (b) as presuppositions. Its final purpose is to confess that Pneuma (a) and Jesus (b) are the same; o de κύριος το πνευμά έστιν. o the serge of Reformation theology exists, w

word " (e.g., the diblet is mot by daily fold Hebrones in Di

II. THE SECTED CROTT OF LAIDING TOTAL 3. NOTE ON CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY IN SWEDEN STATE AULEN OF THE OWN DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTY O

I THINK one may speak of a turning-point in recent Swedish theology, and that this crisis belongs to the first ten years of this century. In the last years of the previous century and the first of the new the Ritschlian theology—especially that of Wilhelm Herrmann-had a large influence among young Swedish theologians. It was assumed that Christianity must be approached from an historical and ethical point of view.

In the first ten years of our century some new leading ideas began to appear, although perhaps not yet involving any complete reconstruction. The most obvious of those ideas was that a new stress was laid upon the significance and importance of the Church, as against the individualism of Pietism and the old liberal theology. This idea of the Church was, however, coupled with a new investigation of Luther.

I will distinguish two different groupings of leading ideas,

Trus Trout Present between a said and the because however

I. THE FIRST GROUP CONCERNS THE IDEA OF REVELATION

1. Revelation must be understood as activity. Revelation certainly is the word of God, but this word is at the same time His work. Revelation of God is God's work. The revealed God is the living and active God.

2. This work is a continuous work. Revelation cannot be understood as static, it must be understood as a continuous activity of the living God. From this point of view the living Kyrios and the Pneuma are emphasized, as against historicism.

3. This clearly involved the emergence of the importance of the Church—the Church understood as the "communion" or fellowship of those who are called and gathered together through the Holy Spirit. We do not exist as isolated individuals related to "the historical Jesus," but we stand in a living fellowship where Christ is the Lord.

4. In connexion with this view Archbishop Söderblom once spoke about "a mysticism of personality" to be distinguished from "the mysticism of infinity." I think that the Archbishop nowadays prefers other expressions, but this distinction and the view behind it was important in the situation of that time. We did there it as bearing ly andrew but as affects

II. THE SECOND GROUP OF LEADING IDEAS

1. A new emphasis upon Holiness, upon the Holy God—
i.e., an emphasis upon God as the Sovereign, the Lord, and upon
the distinction between God and man. This involves a revolt
against the anthropocentrism of earlier theology, and against
the humanization of the conception of God, which is so characteristic of all the leading theology from the Enlightenment to our
own century.

2. The dualistic idea. Christianity cannot be understood from a monistic and evolutionary view. It is necessary to emphasize with the N.T. the dualism between the will of God and the hostile will. Without this background the work of

Christ cannot be approached and realized.

3. The eschatological idea. Theology begins to realize that this idea is by no means secondary but something very essential for Christianity. There is an increasing opposition to an optimistic-evolutionary view of Christianity and of the kingdom of God.

Now there is obviously a certain tension between the two groups of leading ideas here mentioned. As especially characteristic of the situation in Sweden I will emphasize (1) that the second group of leading ideas appeared comparatively early; (2) that this group of ideas exists in connexion with the first-mentioned group and therefore is protected against one-sidedness.

I suggest that it is necessary for the theology of our time to have a full and clarifying criticism not only of the theology of the previous generation, but also of the whole period of the "humanized" theology which comes from the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. But that of course does not mean that this important period ought to be regarded as a parenthesis.

III.—PRIMITIVE CHRISTOLOGY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE PRESENT

1. ΤΗΣΟΥΣ Ο ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ By GERHARD KITTEL

1. In every part of the Tradition, word and deed of Jesus are found indissolubly linked together to form an organic unity (Matt. xi. 5; Acts x. 36, 38; John ii. 11, iv. 41). In contemporary Judaism these two are quite separate; the rabbi is not the same as the worker of miracles, though he occasionally calls

in his assistance (Chanina ben Dosa and the son of Rabbi Gamaliel, bab. Berakoth, 34 b). Upon this combination of word and deed is based the authority of Jesus in the New Testament and for his contemporaries (Mark ii. 5 ff.). It is precisely this combination which reveals the presence of ο έρχομενος (Matt. xi. 2 ff.). For the New Testament and for Primitive Christianity Jesus is never merely the worker of miracles. Any theology which recognizes and appreciates only one of these two "moments" is measured by the New Testament standard—on an erroneous path. One kind of theology emphasizes the miracles and forgets the word, while another theology only knows of the timeless "word," divorced from all history, and excises all record of the actions of the Christ of God in the events which took place in Palestine in the third decade of the Christian era. Both methods are equally false.

2. John the Baptist finds an evident point of contact for

his "repent" in the old prophetic demand for repentance. The same is true of Jesus' call to repentance. For the rabbis the connection with the Old Testament is mostly, if not exclusively, one of pure literalism. Jesus, however, leaves aside everything non-essential, and goes back to the deepest meaning and spirit of the Old Testament religion. His gaze is completely directed towards the holiness of the living God. Where Judaism has preserved any kind of connection with the Old Testament, from which it took its rise, this gaze has never been completely lost. But it is no longer clear; it has been clouded either through excessive devotion to outward forms of ritual or through an external nationalism based upon the consciousness of being the chosen people. The novel element in the teaching of Jesus is not the presence of ethical religious demands, but the concentration upon them.

3. Jesus speaks " is eξουσίαν έχων"; and this was felt to involve οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν (Matt. vii. 29). Rabbinic Judaism knows only the authority of the letter "as it is written." Whereas Jesus opposes to all tradition and all literalism His έγω δὲ λέγω υμιν which is controlled by the standard set forth in the spirit and meaning of the Old Testament that is, by the holy will of God. This constitutes Him and by this He recognizes Himself as the one who brings the fulfilment (πληρῶσαι), and demonstrates the πλείον περισσεύειν (Matt. v. 17, 20)-i.e., exemplifies it in its deepest, most significant,

radical form, free from all compromise.

4. There can be no doubt that this radicalism is strengthened to the utmost by the "eschatological emphasis." This also is in the first place derived from prophetic themes. The prophets knew of no better way by which to emphasize their call for repentance than by pointing to the day of Jahwe. This eschatology continued to live and broke forth into a passionate flame in the messianic and apocalyptic movements of later days of Judaism. The eschatological messianic character of the message of Jesus is therefore not something new and different from his time. But what is new is the amalgamation, based upon a true appreciation of the prophetic message, of the ethical point of view which is only to a slight degree emphasized in eschatology proper, seeing that it is but little moved by the call for repentance. Jesus, again, is neither moral preacher nor eschatologist, but each of the two attains its meaning only by being brought into contact with the other. All attempts to separate the one from the other produce a picture of Jesus which is either dissolved into fantastic speculations or insipid banalities. The error of the "Interimsethik"-theory is equally obvious. The radicalism of Jesus' demand is not the abandonment of all attempts to set detailed ethical norms for practical everyday life, but the immediacy and exclusiveness with which He placed men before the reality of the Holy God

5. The whole New Testament eschatology is fulfilled in the person of Jesus. The present eschatology is fulfilled in the historical presence of His person, the future eschatology in the parousia of the Son of Man, as ἀπαρχή in His πνεῦμα (2 Cor. v. 5; iii. 17 f.). Since, however, His eschatology is ethical, and His ethic is eschatological, the same is completely true of the demand which Jesus makes upon men: this also, when separated from His person and His pneuma, is devoid of meaning. For then there is only left us the "Ihr lasst den Armen schuldig werden": that means either resignation or despair. In the person of Jesus, on the other hand, the Holy God is completely manifested, the God who is both holy and yet loving; in Jesus judgment and forgiveness are presented together. Neither the message of God's holy wrath nor the message of His forgiving love is "doctrine" concerning God: everything that the N.T. has to say treats of the authority and reality of Christ's "appearing"—that is, of the Logos who oaps everer in the preaching, working and dying of Jesus sub Pontio Pilato, mason bus since and ni direct

6. Thus it is that the beginning of Matt. v. is not: "Blessed are the perfect," "Blessed are they who have done everything to meet the radical demand," but "Blessed are the πτωχοί, the πεινώντες καὶ διψώντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην." Therefore the promise is not "Ye shall be declared blameless, because ye have fulfilled everything," but ἐλεηθήσονται (Matt. v. 7), ἐλεύκαναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ αἰματι τοῦ ἀρνίου (Rev. vii. 14). Therefore the κατέβη δεδικαιωμένος is said of him who knows

nothing but ὁ θεὸς ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἀμαρτωλῷ (Luke xviii. 13). Therefore the call of the διδάσκαλος and προφήτης, and the promise of the ζυγός χρηστός, goes forth to the κοπιῶντες and πεφορτισμένοι (Matt. xi. 28 ff.). approvet. "He target them as ale having authority and not

in any case port it as one such brixed to reach "). The question ΉΕΟΤΣ Ο ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ By THE REV. C. H. DODD

as the Sembes" (38 to week and the Sember "like a severeign.

A. THE TRACHER TO SEASON TO SEASON THE

whet may soo be

(1) THE Gospels in general, in spite of their "high" Christology (in varying degrees), represent Jesus as being commonly addressed as "Rabbi" (διδάσκαλε, ἐπιστάτα), and describe his followers as "disciples" (μαθηταί)—similarly in the Talmud, talmidhe Jeshu ha-Nozri: cf. talmidhe ha-chakamim. (2) Many of his traditional sayings are in the form of apophthegms, like those of contemporary Rabbis, and in some cases the same, or closely similar, sayings are handed down also under the names of other teachers—e.g., "with what measure ye mete...," etc. (Sota, i. 7), "the Sabbath was made for man...," etc., attributed to R. Simeon b. Menasiah in Mech. Exod., 109 b. (3) Like other Rabbis, he often bases his teaching on an interpretation of the Torah, of which no jet or tittle can pass away while the present world-order ("heaven and earth") remains. Up to a point he accepts the current principles of interpretation, and in particular he assents to the summary of the Torah in the two great commandments (which was probably already current; see evidence in Abrahams' Studies in Pharisaism, vol. i., pp. 19-35; so Luke x. 25-28) interpreting the "second commandment" in the sense of Tobit iv. 5 and Hillel apud Aboth d' Rabbi Nathan, cited by Abrahams, loc. cit. Accordingly he is challenged with test-questions of legal interpretation (e.g., on divorce and on the death-penalty for adultery), and he in turn puts similar questions to the "scribes." (4) In the course of such discussions, however, he reveals an attitude to the Law and the Tradition which the dominant school of Pharisaism regarded as inconsistent with loyalty to the Jewish religion. He explicitly renounces the "tradition of the elders," and claims to interpret the Torah independently. His "interpretations" sometimes amount to reversals of express provisions -e.g., on divorce and on oaths- and there is at least one saying (Mark vii. 15) which (except on a forced and unnatural exegesis) implies a direct repudiation of the written Law. Thus, although the passage on the Law in Matt. v. 17-48, with its formal

antithesis of "it was said to them of old ... but I say unto you" must be regarded as a literary elaboration, yet it represents not unfairly the extremely independent attitude which Jesus takes to the Law and the Tradition, whether in approval or in disapproval. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes" (&s & \(\frac{1}{2} \) ovariav & \(\frac{1}{2} \) wow? = k'shalet, "like a sovereign," in any case not "as one authorized to teach"). The question of his "authority," however, was raised more decisively by what he did than by what he said. His high-handed assumption of control over the Temple-courts was clearly an act that lay outside the rôle of a Rabbi.

B. THE PROPHET

I. According to Mark vi. 15, Jesus was regarded in Galilee as "a prophet like one of the (O.T.) prophets" (προφήτης ώς είς τῶν προφητῶν): cf. also Mark vi. 4, Luke xiii. 33. On what did such an estimate rest? (1) We must put first that assumption of "authority"—an independent and sovereign way of teaching, in contrast to that of the Rabbis. Again (2), while he sometimes taught in apophthegms, much of his utterance has the poetical quality distinctive of the prophetic writings (see Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord). One such poetical passage is noted by Luke as being a "pneumatic" or inspired utterance Luke x. 21), and this may well reflect the impression made by the public speech of Jesus on many occasions. (3) There is a suggestion of other "pneumatic" traits such as were associated with prophecy, such as vision and audition. On the analogy of O.T. prophecy there is nothing incredible about the accounts of the inaugural vision with the Divine voice, or the vision of Satan fallen from heaven. (4) Jesus, like other prophets, uttered predictions, having an historical reference. (5) Like the prophets, he made use of symbolic acts. A clear example is the breaking of the bread at the Last Supper, and it is probable that certain of the "miracles" are to be so interpreted —e.g., the Feeding of the Multitude and the "Cursing" of the Fig-Tree (see Wheeler Robinson on "Prophetic Symbolism" in Old Testament Essays, pub. Griffin). All these are traditional prophetic traits, and might account for the popular estimate of Jesus as προφήτης ώς είς τῶν προφητῶν.

II. This resemblance to the O.T. prophets can be traced in more inward traits. (1) Jesus is represented as having received (like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others) a definite vocation in a 'pneumatic' experience, and the sense of vocation, or even predestination (of. Jer. i. 5), is implied in certain sayings (Mark ix. 37; Matt. xv. 24; Luke xii. 50). (2) This vocation

involves the possession of a Divine revelation received in intimate communion. Jesus "knows" God and is "known by" Him (cf. Jer. i. 5, ix. 24), and "all things (that he teaches) are delivered unto" him by God (cf. Amos. iii. 7). Hence, like the prophets, he is (3) the representative of God; to follow his teaching is to do the will of God; to reject him is to reject God (Mark ix. 37: cf. 1 Sam. viii. 7; Ezek. xxxiii. 30-33, etc.). (4) Like the prophets, Jesus has a mission to the nation, and his words and deeds are related to national destiny. Hence also he must appear in Jerusalem and in the Temple, for "s prophet may not perish out of Jerusalem." Like Isaiah and Ezekiel, he assembles a "remnant" who are to be the nucleus of the New Israel, bound by the New Covenant (cf. Jer. xxxi.). (5) Jesus renews in his own person that prophetic type of personal religion which is the distinctive achievement of Israel (in contrast to the mystical type: cf. Heiler, Das Gebet), while he carries it forward into hitherto unknown developments

(op. cit., pp. 239 sq.). it to another out shifty

III. The purport of the teaching of Jesus recalls that of the prophets. (1) He is represented as appealing to Isaiah (Mark vii. 6), Hosea (Matt. ix. 13, xii. 6), II. Isaiah and Jeremiah (Mark xi. 17), on behalf of the inward and ethical character of religion against the formalism of contemporary Judaism. (2) As Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and indeed the prophets in general, attacked the unethical optimism of the "false prophets," and declared that the "Day of Jahweh" should be not a day of triumph for the "chosen" people but a condemnation of their iniquity, so Jesus dissociated himself from the national religious hope of his day, and pronounced the rejection of Israel. And as they interpreted the fantastic eschatological conceptions of their time in terms of political and historical realities (the menace of Assyria or Babylon), so he seems to have seen in the approaching Roman crisis the maturing of the divine plan. (3) Like the prophets, he announced the establishment of the Rule of God as certain and imminent, in face of the power of evil in the world. (4) In view of all this, the ethical side of religion became in his teaching once more a matter of inward power and insight, instead of scrupulous adherence to rules. For the prophets the will of God is that which is seen to be right by the native faculties of the human spirit (as the ox knoweth his owner and the stork in the heavens her appointed time). In developed Judaism it had come to be that which could be learned from Scripture and tradition. Jesus appealed afresh to the "single eye" of the healthy human spirit (τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' έαντων ού κρίνετε το δίκαιον). Επιβαγέται αί εποπεπέδεστε είπ

This is not to say that his teaching is a mere reissue of

O.T. prophecy. In many respects it departs decisively from the dominant ideas of the prophets. But by reviving the general outlook of prophetic religion he found a starting-point for his

own distinctive message.

IV. Jesus recognized in John the Baptist "a prophet and more than a prophet," though "the least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he." To consider what Jesus Himself was, "more than a prophet," lies outside the scope of this paper, but it seems necessary to indicate the point at which the prophetic element in His ministry naturally leads beyond itself. He sees in His own ministry something which does not merely revive prophecy but fulfils it. Prophets and kings (or rightsous men) have desired to see what His followers now see, and have not seen it (Matt. xiii. 16-17; Luke x. 23-24). Something greater than Jonah (the prophet) and than Solomon (the wise king) is here (Matt. xii. 41-42; Luke xi. 31-32). The Kingdom of God is not merely imminent: it has arrived (ἐφθασεν ἐφ ὑμᾶς). Thus while the content of the prophetic message is present in the teaching of Jesus, it is present in a form which passes from anticipation to realization. This carries with it a profound change in the religious character and value of the teaching itself, and has important implications in regard to His Person.

ΊΗΣΟΥΣ Ο ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ

Level party and the act to endure the control of the " false process being being

By PROFESSOR N. MICKLEM

In this paper I have strictly confined myself to the subject ascribed to me; I must not be understood to mean that the whole work of Christ can be subsumed under these headings, or to desire upon the basis of such categories as these to build a purely humanistic christology.

to abla label to a real side of the real forms of the second and the second sec

1. To the early Church Jesus was the risen and glorified Lord, but he was none the less "teacher," though the term was little used.

This is sufficiently illustrated by the idea, constantly recurring in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers, that Christianity is a μίμησις, an imitation of Jesus. Again, Christianity is a όδός, a way of life. Jesus by his words and by his life (especially in his "great humility," ταπεινοφροσύνη, and his steadfastness in martyrdom) is the great teacher, the great exemplar.

2. Paul, perhaps alone of New Testament writers, was personally familiar with Peter and the circle of eye-witnesses. Our oldest, most coherent, and most convincing picture of the teaching of Jesus comes to us, not from the Gospels, but through Paul; for Paul describes the operations and fruits of "the Spirit," that is, of the Spirit of Jesus, the character and life of Jesus as it should repeat itself in Christians. But whereas Matthew, followed in the main by Gentile Christianity, represents Jesus as proclaimer and teacher of a new law, Paul represents him as kindler and inspirer of a new quality of life which is an authentic but not slavish following of his teaching and example.

3. The conception of Jesus as teacher and illuminator is

of incomparable importance for christology:

(a) Only in so far as Jesus is teacher and illuminator does he appeal to our insight; only in so far as he appeals to our insight are faith and obedience of any spiritual worth; only in so far as faith and obedience are of spiritual worth can our christology belong to the sphere of religion.*

(b) Every christology that is not firmly based on the teaching of Jesus, in word and example, is mythological in form and ultimately impersonalt in conception. This is sufficiently illustrated by the whole history of orthodox

use Issish's term, or "the Israel after the Spiritgolotsirds of (c) If today Christian philosophy must express itself in terms of values, then the values for which Jesus stood and which he incarnated must be fundamental for christology. If today we proclaim the divinity of Jesus, it must be, not in virtue of omnipotence or omniscience or other supposed metaphysical attributes of deity (which, as a matter of fact, Jesus did not possess), but in virtue of that perfection of his soul which his teaching and life make known to us and which we ourselves recognize as divine amon odd quilled dedgood as some susel

the "sinners," disinheriterineral PRoperty Brises, to rise to the great

1. In many of his sayings t and actions and in much of his outlook upon the world Jesus undoubtedly stands in the prophetic succession of Israel. In the positive divine values which he saw in this world and in history he stands with the prophets over against the apocalyptists. He did not repudiate the term "Messiah," but there is reason to think that he was not himself the subject of his preaching. He came as prophet to mould the course of history by summoning his people to their God-

^{*} Cf. J. Oman, The Problem of Faith and Freedom, Grace and Personality.
† I.e., quasi-material, non-ethical, physiomorphic instead of anthropomorphic.
† E.g., the denunciations of the Pharisees, the wees over the cities.
† E.g., the Last Supper, the cleansing of the Temple.

given destiny (see infra). His thought was of his work, not of himself. A christology built upon his supposed "self-consciousness" apart from his work is based upon the inscrutable teaching of Josus carnes to us, nor from the Or

and speculative.

2. The teaching of Jesus implies the absolute value of the individual soul; but primarily Jesus' message, like that of the prophets before him, was to the nation, Israel. Only on this understanding can we make intelligible negatively his refusal to go to Alexandria or Athens or to become an itinerant preacher, and positively his policy in going to Jerusalem when Herod and the Pharisees made impossible the continuance of his work in Galilee.

3. From Issiah the "Remnant" conception, though not the phrase, dominated the higher thought of Israel. Thus are is a keyword with Jeremiah, who calls upon Israel (north and south) to be Israel; similarly Israel (though not necessarily the whole empirical Israel) is the "Servant of the Lord" whose function it is to bring the world to God. So, too, Ezekiel seeks to gather the nucleus of the true Israel to be. Thus also Daniel (in a passage parallel to and interpretative of the "Son of Man" vision) sees the small stone "cut out without hands" (the persecuted remnant of faith) grow to cover the whole earth. Notice that the "remnant" conception, to use Isaiah's term, or "the Israel after the Spirit," to use Paul's, is in potentiality, but not in fact, coterminous with the whole people of Israel, and that the remnant might, in fact, though never in intention, be limited to a single individual. The remnant-idea which dominated the higher thought of Israel dominated also, I believe, the thought of Jesus. If Israel made the great refusal, then he and his disciples must be the nucleus of the true Israel. If all the disciples desert him and flee, he still must stand for Israel, though alone.

Jesus came, as prophet, calling the common people of Israel, the "sinners," disinherited by the Pharisees, to rise to the great destiny of Israel to bring the knowledge of God to the world. This is shown (a) by the names associated with him; (b) by the

course of his action.

4. Thus the term "the Son " or "the Son of God " refere

prima facie to Israel, as in the Old Testament.;
"The Man" or "the Son of Man" refers prima facie to
Israel, as in Daniel, for it cannot be shown that "the Son of Man '' was a current messianic term.
Similarly the παῖς or Servant who is martyred is prima

facie Israel.

A.c., quasi-mater al, pour minion! physical control is retain is N. Micklem, Prophecy and Eschatology, ch. v. † Ibid., ch. vi. 1 See B. W. Bacon, Jesus, the Son of God. NAII' LDO

So, too, the one who rises "on the third day according to the Scriptures" is prima facie Israel.*

Undoubtedly the evangelists associate these terms individually with Jesus; in this, it is probable, they misrepresent

the teaching of their Master. January 10 to sharing way

5. When Herod and the Pharisees made the continued ministry in Galilee impossible, † Jesus, as I suppose, sent out a hasty summons through the towns and villages of Galilee through the twelve summoning the people to be ready for the act of God at the coming feast. Having ascertained what measure of support he might expect, he went up to Jerusalem, not as Mark indicates, to proclaim himself Messiah by a "triumphal" entry, an interpretation which the recorded facts and the historical possibilities fail to bear out, but to cleanse the Temple as a great, decisive, prophetic act, thus appealing to Israel to rise to their God-given calling, not against the Romans, but for the whole world, to make the Temple "a house of prayer for all

This interpretation, if it be correct, is of great importance for christology. If such terms as Son of God, Son of Man, Servant, are to be interpreted prophetically, we see the intimate connection between Christology and the theory of the Church.

2. THEORE XPIETOE GEOT TIOE ENTHP

servant of God) was fett to he tandequate and derogatory; it

word was was therefore understood to mean child or Son;

BY PROFESSOR D. KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT.

CHRISTOLOGICAL titles of Jewish and Greek origin are applied to Jesus of Nazareth in the Bible and by the Church. The modern historian, adopting a method of research widely prevalent also among theologians, describes Primitive Christianity as a "New Religion," which, though distinct from Judaism and superseding it, yet quite naturally retained in its language the marks of its origin, and which in the process of conflict with other religious adapted its phraseology to its religious environment. This development is illustrated in the lotthys formula: Incons xouries decorvies awaye. Chaist, first the Greak, then the Latin, translation of the Hebrew Messiah, has its origin in Judaism. Saviour is a typical Hellenistic title, which in

^{*} Hoses vi. 1 f.

† The saying about the leaven of the Pharisess and the leaven of Herod (Mark viii. 15) was already unintelligible when Mark wrote; but Mark preserves the tradition that the mission of the twelve was connected with Herod (Mark vi. 7 ff.). It is this historical situation, not current apocalyptic expectations, which explains the haste of the mission. The otherwise unintelligible question, "Whom do men say that I am ?" (Mark viii. 27), presupposes the mission of the twelve. It is followed by the announcement of Jesus' determination to go to Jerusalem.

the old cults of the rulers was applied to a God who had become manifest (ἐπιφανής). Son of God, which in the Ichthys formula is placed between Christ and Saviour, originated in Judaism, may, however, also have its origin in Hellenism, and, at any rate, was capable of Hellenistic interpretation. All three honorific titles, and also other christological phrases, are linked up with various speculations concerning God and the World, and concerning Time and the end of Time (Jewish Apocalyptic, Hellenistic Mysteries). "Recognizing this, modern scholars attempt to answer the question, how knowledge of the historical figure of Jesus was so quickly transformed into belief in the heavenly Son of God. This is the problem of christology."*

This development of Primitive Christianity from narrow Judaism to the wide horizon of the Hellenistic world taken as a whole is illustrated by the use of the christological titles. Terms of specific Jewish character are interpreted in a new way, are used less and less frequently, or, finally, disappear completely. For example, Messiah was translated into Greek (xpιστός) and was still used, but it was often understood as a proper name; its Latin form is little more than a transcription of the title. Son of God was interpreted in a physical or in a metaphysical sense (Virgin Birth, the Logos christology of the ancient Church). The phrase παῖς θεοῦ (Ebed Jahweh, slave or servant of God) was felt to be inadequate and derogatory; the word mais was therefore understood to mean child or Son; finally, the title almost disappeared. The title Son of man has a similar history. In place of all these titles the description κύριος tended to prevail, and the title Saviour came into the foreground. The New Testament documents show these changes in progress during the first decades.

But against this theory of the development of Primitive Christianity it can be said that, if it be accepted, the significance of the earliest christology and its importance for the Christian Church remain unintelligible until today. Further considerations which point to an essential relation between the Old and New Testaments make this development doubtful, if not impossible, from an historical as well as from a theological point of view.

The passing into the background of the expression slave of God, which has already been noted, was the result of a misconception on the part of that Christianity which was turning away from the theologia crucis and turning towards a theologia gloriae, since it is precisely upon the suffering and death of the Messiah who was obedient to God as the slave of God that the reality of justification and salvation rests. Such a Messiah,

Martin Dibelius, article Christologie des Urchristentums in the encyclopædia Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Second Edition).

and such a Messiah only, abolishes the O.T. law by fulfilling it. The Cross remains unto Jews a stumbling-block (it was also a stumbling-block for the Primitive Church of Jerusalem, and even for the immediate disciples of Jesus the Cross appeared of secondary importance compared with the Resurrection and the Parousia), and unto Gentiles foolishness (the growing Catholic Church attached more importance to a philosophical than to a

paradoxical christology).

If the close connection between the Old and New Testaments be emphasized, and an unjustifiable separation of the two be avoided, it follows inevitably that it is impossible to treat Judaism and Hellenism simply as two equivalent component parts from which Christianity was composed. Scholars in the field of the history of religion and of religious experience who hold Judaism and Hellenism to be equivalent are right in treating Jewish Apocalyptic and Jewish Philosophy (Philo) as belonging to the sphere of Greek-Oriental syncretism, and in this sense no theological importance can be attached to the question whether this or that title of Christ is derived from Judaism or from Hellenism.

The matter is, however, very different when it is a question of that Judaism which based its claims upon the O.T., and which in rejecting the promised Messiah showed itself stubborn and disobedient against God. Here Judaism retains its peculiar character, when compared with the ancient religions. Contrasted with a mere Christ-cult, which is nothing more than ancient and modern estheticism—contrasted with a mere Christ-mysticism, which is nothing more than an ancient and modern human self-satisfaction, there stands a Church of Christ, the O. and N.T. People of God, represented by the Messiah as the remnant of Israel, as the Israel of the latter days, as the true Israel. All Christians are woven into that history of salvation which begins with the history of the People of God under the Old Covenant, and leads on to the history of Christ in the New Covenant and to the events of the end.*

Everything depends upon the Messiahship. Titles of specifically Jewish character may have been used less frequently, the Jewish xplotos may have been misunderstood because it was thought of as a proper name, but the name Christ did remain. The name is a mark which shows the Jewish origin of christology; better, it is an O.T. name, and it cannot be obliterated. It is an essential element in the faith of all Christian denominations that Jesus will come again as the Messiah to judge the world and to establish the Kingdom

^{*} Cf. the author's essay Die Kirche des Urchristentums, in the Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann, 1927; and Theologische Blätter, 1927, No. 11.

of God which has already been realized in Him, but hitherto only in Him. It must be remembered that when we speak of Jesus, of Christianity, of Christology, of Primitive Christianity, we are speaking of the Messiah. The Messiah is He whom God has elected, He who as the slave of God fulfilled the story of suffering narrated in Isaiah klii. ff.; further, it is He who did not abide in the realm of death and humiliation, but who has been exalted as the Son of man (Acts vii. 56) that He might

come again in the latter days.

The original significance of the expression Son of God implies election by God. When this old Oriental title, used to signify the divine origin of a King, was applied to the King of Israel and subsequently to the Messiah, a mythological basis to His authority was excluded; the idea conveyed was rather election and adoption, as is seen by its use in the N.T. (cf. especially Luke iii. 22, Cod. D). The interpretation of the title Son of God must be grounded upon the fact that in the earlier Christian documents it is used to designate the Messiah. It may be that in the Johannine writings the old Messianic titles Son of man and Son of God are brought into connection with Mandsean-Gnostic terminology to express Christ as the Revelation of God, yet, even so, the note of election (God offering Himself in the Son) and the note of eschatology (the latter days being at hand in the present time) remain.

The title Saviour, which has its origin in Hellenistic syncretism and which is used in the N.T. comparatively rarely, is also found in the Johannine writings. The question is whether Jesus as Saviour is only intelligible as the θεὸς ἐμφανής in accordance with the phraseology of the ancient cults (e.g., the worship of the Cæsar). It must not be forgotten that in the O.T. God is called σωτήρ, because He is the God of the Messianic salvation (cf. the use of the verb σώζειν). The more comprehensive phrase Saviour of the World (John iv. 42, I John iv. 14) certainly lies beyond the Jewish idea of the Messiah; but it is only so inasmuch as the Messiah, after He has been rejected by His own people, gains a significance for the whole world.

It is hard to give any precise answer to the question as to whether or to what extent Jesus of Nazareth Himself participated in the christology thus briefly outlined. Christological interpretations of certain details may be later additions. The theory of the secret Messiahship and the detailed prophecies of His Passion are perhaps such additions. Though it is impossible and there is no reason for us to explain the so-called Messiahship of Jesus, yet it is evident that in the figure of Jesus of Nazareth the Old and New Covenants were and must have been interlocked. He who preached (the words of Jesus)

and represented (the deeds of Jesus) the Kingdom of God, He to whom the Church of the Messiah-Jesus bears witness—the Church which He Himself had constituted-He stood in the Messiahship. This confession of His disciples, which was clarified and deepened by the events of the Resurrection, is

not a later christological interpretation.

This Christian witness to the Messianic Son of God protects christology both from docetism and from hero-worship. There is no question here of mythical Christ-speculation nor of the contemplation of the outstanding qualities of a religious genius; everything depends upon the unique commission and call of Jesus. Nor can this call be placed within human history; it emerges rather from the Biblical series of events. diseased a seek as the whether the background is solver thesis.

THEORE XPIETOE GEOT TIOE EQTHP

BY THE REV. SIR EDWYN HOSKYNS, BART.

1. THE distinction between fact and interpretation a false distinction. Both belong together in the concrete occasion of the Life and Death of Jesus.

2. The recognition of this interdependence does not rule out development and clarification of interpretation both theological

and historical

3. The prime historical problem of Christian origins is to discover the relation between the teaching of Jesus and Pauline-Johannine theology. The delineation of the former, not of

the latter, presents the real difficulty.

4. A mere discussion of the significance of titles provides an inadequate introduction to the Christology of the Synoptic Gospels. This may be illustrated by the disagreement among historians as to the meaning of the titles $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma}$, $\iota \dot{\iota} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\sigma}$

5. The titles can only be adequately interpreted after a careful study of the miraculous narratives, the parables, and the

aphoristic utterances of Jesus.

6. The symbolical nature of the miracles discussed in relation to Matt. xi. 2-15; Luke vii. 18-29; Mark iv. 35 to v. 20, vii. 31-37, viii. 22-26; and Mark ii. 1-12. Note the agreement of Q and Mk.

7. The principles of interpretation of parables discussed in relation to the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and of the Marriage Feast of the King's Son (Matt. xxii. 1-14). Both are Christological parables. 8. The importance of the Beelzebub speech, its relation to the narrative of the Temptation and to such sayings as Matt. xi. 16-19, viii. 22: Luke ix. 60. The need of repentance general

and without exception (Luke xiii. 3, 4).

9. Conclusions from the foregoing analysis. The background of miracles, parables, and sayings is soteriological, salvation from sin. The Kingdom of God and the Christology are inseparable. Mark x. 17-23, re-examined in the light of this conclusion. Jesus is completely distinct and unique not in degree but in kind; note the use of weight agree in the Gospels.

10. If, then, men and women are distinct from Jesus as those who need salvation are separated from their Saviour, the question arises as to whether the background is solely Jewish.

11. The answer is yes and no. There was a complete geographical limitation. Matt. x. 5, 6 is historically accurate in its general sense, and his editing of Mark vii. 24-30 may be accurate in detail. But this does not mean that a mission to the world lay outside the horizon of Jesus. There is no real support for the view that Jesus was a Jewish reformer (Mark ii. 21, 22), and the narrative of the so-called cleansing of the Temple seems to rule this out. Compare the parable (Luke xiii. 6) and the miracle of the fig-tree (Mark xi. 12 ff.). The choice of the titles Son of God, Son of Man, in preference to Christ, may also be explained as anti-Jewish. Salvation is of the Jews; but not for the Jews only. The whole narrative trembles on the brink of a greater happening, and the dividingline is the death of Jesus. Until that is accomplished both the sphere and the efficacy of salvation are limited. Mark iv. 22 the lattery prosents the p covers the whole Synoptic tradition.

12. The death of Jesus not primarily the death of a martyr in the cause of reform, but a redemptive, voluntary, and liberating act. Only thus is the narrative of the events leading up to the Crucifixion really intelligible; in addition to such sayings as Luke xii. 50, and the $\delta\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ $\pi a\theta\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}\nu$ sayings in Mark, this is the meaning of the words at the Last Supper. Nor must the sayings concerning the Resurrection be treated merely as semicredal interpolations. The contrast between three and four days is the historical element. Death could not permanently

hold Him.

13. The words at the Last Supper give the interpretation of the Death to the disciples. The covenant is by His Blood, and its benefits are shown to be attained only by sharing in His Body and His Blood—that is, by likewise taking up their cross and following Him. These words are formal, their content and significance are given by the narrative of Gethsemane,

by the narratives of the Temptation, by the application of the word miones to the relation of Jesus to His Father, and by

the repeated descriptions of Jesus praying.

14. This is the victory of the Son of God-in flesh-that is, geographically limited and tempted from within and without. The Crucifixion is the revelation of the nature of sin, and His submission to death is the redemptive act. The student of the Synoptic Gospels cannot and must not use the language of orthodoxy at the moment he is interpreting the New Testament. He cannot move easily with such terms as the Deity of Christ, His Human and Divine nature, His Pre-existence, but this does not mean that they are not necessary for bringing out what is latent in the Synoptic Gospels. The figure of Jesus is not an epiphany of the Son of God, but neither is it an ascending deification of a man. If we must use the terms ascent and descent, then He descended—that is, He came from above as Redeemer and Saviour. To be all beyond to seek out in appendi

15. If this be a fair analysis of the Synoptic Gospels, then the Pauline-Johannine interpretations belong to the same

Nature an infinite value. The the strongth of this tyre box in

a modernachasa kadan mana mana mendan pamakan musan

and appropriate towards, the evil of sin and guilte.

world as the Synoptic Gospels. named out to From out or gainer in Theo second burned outside

3. O ETTATPOMENOE

BY GUSTAF AULEN THE history of the doctrine of the Atonement seems to have been somewhat unsatisfactorily written. It has been too much confined to the history of the satisfaction-theory. Anselm has, for instance, a quite too dominant position. His theory is, in the main, a continuation of ideas which had been traditional in the West since the days of Cyprian, and his own most characteristic thought—the demonstration nihil rationabilius cogitari potest-was not at all accepted in the Middle Ages. It seems that Anselm is indebted mainly to the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century for his position in the history of dogma.

In the history of the doctrine of the Atonement we can distinguish two leading types. They are already both to be found in the ancient Church. The first is more Greek, the second more Latin. The motifs of the first type are conflict and victory,

the motifs of the second type satisfactio and meritum.

Greek theology enphasizes, as is well known, the Incarnation. But the death and resurrection of our Lord are often considered as the consummation of the Incarnation: here the divine and eternal life has conquered sin, death and the devil. This conflict and victory we find depicted in drastic, at times grotesquely picturesque, terms.

The Latin satisfactio-line is different. The view here is rational and legal: Christ satisfies the legal claims of God, and

acquires the "sufficing merit."

In fact, the tension between the two types determines the history of the atonement-motif in theology.* Usually the first type has been far too much neglected in the history of dogma. The drastic pictorial imagery and the mythological trappings in which it has been set forth have proved a stumblingblock (Ritschl, Rashdall). But the verdict has been too summary. In reality the first-type has its strength in its more organic view of the relation between God and Christ (we observe, e.g., the idea of "the Divine Nature" as active in the work of the Atonement) and in its main thought: the Atonement is a victory over the powers that oppose the Divine Will. The danger in the case of type II. is pre-eminently that the leading idea of Christology-God in Christ-is on the way to lose its function. The Atonement is, in the language of the old theology, a work of the Human Nature of Christ: the contribution of the Divine Nature consists only in giving to the work of the Human Nature an infinite value. But the strength of this type lies in its unwavering emphasis upon God's radical condemnation of, and antagonism towards, the evil of sin and guilt.

Both types are in mediæval theology often intertwined. For Luther the first type decidedly dominates: Christ is first and foremost the Warrior and Conqueror, who defeats and overcomes the tyrants of humanity: sin, death, wrath, law, the devil, and hell. This motif is strongest where Luther speaks most simply and spontaneously, as in the hymns and the Little Catechism. Luther has a special liking for the drastic pictorial imagery of the ancient Church. He himself emphasizes the connection between this view and the leading Christological idea. In the great Commentary on the Galatians he writes: "Hic vides t credere et confiteri articulum de Divinitate Christi. Quem ubi Arius negavit, necesse fuit eum etiam negare articulum redemptionis. . . . Quare abolere peccatum, destruere mortem, afferre maledictionem in seipso et donare iustitiam, vitam in lucem producere, afferre benedictionem in seipso, hoc est in nihilum redigere hæc et creare illa, sunt solius divince potentiae opera" (Luther's Works, Weimar edition, arch humans with to distance and

Vol. XL. i, p. 441). Later orthodoxy carried the second type through to its

[.] But we cannot describe the history of the doctrine of the Atonement as a rivalry between an "objective" and a "subjective" view. This perspective is not clear enough—the word "subjective" is here, in fact, meaningless.

logical conclusion. "Satisfaction" settles the opposition between God's righteousness and His love. The resolute determination to avoid any doctrine of a merely complaisant forgiveness is most praiseworthy. But the alternatives are stated in the form: either complaisant love or satisfaction. The doubtful thing is not that juridical terms are used, but that these terms are used for bringing about a rational explanation

of the Atonement, levelling out its irrationality.

In the period from the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century to the end of the last century—the period of the humanization of the idea of God—the leading theology dissolves the inner structure of type II. The satisfaction theory is opposed as being too Jewish and too inhuman. Theology denies any rivalry between God's righteousness and His love, and speaks of God as love throughout. But here, as always, the real question is not about God being love, but about the quality of God's love. In fact, the divine love here loses something of its radical opposition towards evil and of its unfathomable depth. The atonement motif is being weakened, and no real reconstruction is made. The way towards type I. is barred essentially by the tendency to force Christianity into the framework of a monistic-evolutionary theory of life. We find a rivalry between the atonement-motif and the "revelation"-motif—and the latter prevails!

As to the two types the first undoubtedly harmonizes better with the fundamental idea of Christianity. It shows no deep understanding to reject it on account of the mythological form in which it is clothed. It would be more reasonable to oppose the much-belauded "purification" of the idea of God which has been the result of the "humanization" of God's

character

If our interpretation of Christianity is not to lose contact with the New Testament, we must give up all attempts to force Christianity into the framework of a monistic-evolutionary theory of life. Our view must be dramatic, and its background dualistic, at least in the sense that everything that is hostile to the will of God must clearly stand out in all its consequences. The work of the Atonement is for the New Testament first and foremost a work of release through the conquest of all hostile powers—sin, death, and the devil. The Kyrios is the Conqueror. The perspective is a double-sided one: perfect and present; the victory is there already as a fact, and yet the fight is going on until the last foe has been put down (1 Cor. xv. 26).

Seen from this dramatic point of view, the Cross immediately and necessarily stands in the centre of the Christian faith. The sovereign divine Love realizes the work of Atonement

through the Cross-i.e., through giving itself out in sacrifice. The sovereign divine Love is marked by the stamp of the Cross. A superior restaurance property to the superior to the

1. God is subject for the work of atonement, not only in a partial sense as starting-point (as in the old orthodoxy), but as the operative agent all through. Christology and Atonement are organically united. In Christ God reconciled the world to Himself (2 Cor. v. 19). Christology is only an empty word if the work of Christ does not determine the quality of God.

- 2. Hence, for the characteristically Christian view, God is not only a God who in elevated majesty receives the sacrifices of man, but He offers sacrifices of His own, nay, He sacrifices
- 3. We are confronted here by an element in the Divine Love which must be described as "irrational." We recognize here the leading motif of early Christianity: the God who cares for sinners—the Love that cannot be confined in the categories of justice. The radical opposition of God towards evil is more outstanding than ever. But here is no place for a rationalistic levelling out of irrationality. The tension between love and wrath does not disappear. The wrath is there, but the wrath is melted in His love.*

Two conclusions: (a) The above view extinguishes the rivalry between the idea of Revelation and the idea of Atonement. The revelation consists essentially in the Atonement. The revealed God is the God of atonement. Any rival idea weakens the revelation; it loses its character of activity and its deepest

Ariel animal

- quality. and on the contract the said of the contract (b) Also the contest between the idea of the Atonement and the idea of the Incarnation is being extinguished. The consummation of the Incarnation is the Atonement. The old Greek thought as to the consummation of the Incarnation in the Cross and the Resurrection has a deep truth. The full right of the idea of the Incarnation is obvious: all depends upon the fact that it is God who in Christ reconciled the world to Himself. The Atonement is not man's way to God but God's way to man.
- The passibility of God! This thought is justified as an opposition against a supposed anabela of God. But the rejection of old and new "patripassianism" is legitimate in so far as it stands for the sovereignty of God and excludes all talking of a divine self-redemption. Surely we can speak of a passibility of God; but this passibility will be far too passive if we do not see it in connection with the motif of conflict and victory.

the severege divise Lore can age that werk of Atomonet

Himself Love, Me suffered from James for Jaroch with Israel of and all of o Extateomenox and later the

By PAUL ALTHAUS

pot sing por the absolute degree of decided solicingly interest. As general expression of the importance of the Crucified only the following is suitable: the Crucified unites God with guilty man-

kind by suffering and overwhelming the judgment.

In this judgment there are three different moments: (a) the doom of God's wrath (death, vanity, and emptiness of life, being delivered to sin and to the kingdom of sin, by which God is darkened): a fate lying as a burden on mankind, without being understood as what it really is; (b) judgment of conscience, by which the silent doom becomes vocal through hearing the commandments of God; (c) the completion and "transmutation" of this judgment by the Gospel, by means of which God creates a new will according with the judgment.

There are three points of view—to be applied to the Crucified:

A. Jesus has sanctified the wrath by taking it on Himself and bearing it, as the Son in a specially inward sense. As His faith and love were attacked by the world of sin, He suffered from God to the point of experiencing loneliness and despair. So He took upon Himself our punishment and overwhelmed it,

by realizing faith and love to the utmost. It is in a realization of the same of the same

B. So at the same time the struggle between God and man has been fully revealed and brought to an end by the Cross. Suffering by which the judgment of conscience in sinners is awakened. were our out that moni years nother ton ai altow

1. The fulness of that struggle was realized by Jesus, because He God's own Son-delivered Himself absolutely to God. By offering His work and life to the Father, He honours God as God and offers a perfect service.

2. Therefore the struggle of God with sin becomes the

external as well as the internal fate of Jesus. It is a little a

The Holy One of God is condemned in God's name; so the antagonism between God and mankind is deeply revealed, and even the heights of humanity (religion and ethics) are condemned by it. It is not permissible to speak only of a crisis of Israel or of a general tragical law of the history of religion. The sin of the Cross is a fact that touches the whole of mankind with the strength of present conviction. We are all guilty of it. We perceive in it God's holy wrath, by which sin is compelled to action and igned to another product the shole sate Dailfail

So for the external fact. But Jesus has also realized that struggle in His internal life. As being the Son and as being Himself Love, He suffers from Israel, for Israel, and with Israel the painful relation between God and man. So He bears the sins of the world. We cannot say how deep His sufferings were because we do not know either the inner life of Him, who knew not sin, nor the absolute degree of perfect solidarity into which love can enter with sinners. We leave older dogmatic standpoints by not teaching equivalence of guilt and punishment.

C. By (A) and (B) the death of Jesus reveals a love that acknowledges the full seriousness of judgment and the highest measure of man's sinfulness and yet remains love. So we meet God's love in the Cross, moving us to repentance and faith,

and by it transforming judgment into salvation. med product a face fring as a burder on manufact, without bem

understood as what it spally in (b) independ of conscience which the silent closin because wood through the sing The theology of the Cross outlined above contains a theory of representation, which is to be treated now.

1. The meaning of representation differs with regard to

physical and to personal life. - main la station sands on the ill.

(a) In the first case (whether it be the social division of abour or the service of love), work is really transferred to representatives. The purpose of the action is the external result of action. Of course, there are to be acknowledged personal and moral presuppositions too e.g., community (exclusive representation).

(b) In personal life, it is impossible to transfer work. The

meaning of representation is to be found in the strength of impulses by which new deeds are produced. The burden of work is not taken away from us, but we are moved to new

work by representation (inclusive representation).

But here, too, the deed of the representative remains in its special quality lonely and single, and in that sense exclusive. It must be acknowledged that personal life is not only activity, but in the first place receiving; not primarily an attitude, but a relation. So life with God is not in the first place obedience, but at the very beginning the gift of communion. So repreentation concerning the depth of life in the presence of God is exclusive as well as inclusive, the cand to at dule i odr nave ban

2. That is the character of forgiveness (John xvii. 19): no forgiveness on earth without representative sanctification and suffering. Therefore Jesus Christ alone has power of forgiveness. For He alone is living holy representation. Therefore forgiveness on earth is dependent on the "name of Jesus." In His Cross alone all the questions of forgiveness are solved.

(a) Jesus' representation is exclusive. For He as the crucified founds a new relation with God-namely, God's communion with us, knowing no condition. This absence of conditions may-by faith-be expressed in exclusive sentences: because He by obedience died, the disobedient ones are allowed to stand before God too. His sufferings and death are the reason why we with even imperfect repentance may come to God (Christ for us). The to dear sait barrent that well rait on said

(b) But this communion with God has at the same time sanctifying power. By the new relationship a new attitude of life is awakened. So we may call His representation inclusive. The purpose of His obedience and suffering is our obedience and suffering of judgment and repentance (Christ

ARTE INC

in us.)
3. Both elements (2s and b) belong to each other. We cannot follow orthodoxy or mysticism by separating them from each other. Faith in the Cross means faith in His power of forgiveness as well as of sanctification!) If we say propter Christum, we mean two things which yet are one. So believing in the Crucified influences us in a double direction: the Cross means peace and struggle, quietness and yet everlasting movement. Christian ethics are founded on God's judgment that has been passed. Because victory is won, we are still now fighting or real action and hairly paration of a single state of an arrange of the single state of the sin

the the seme time distinguishes itself short bit ben differ 4. KTPIOZ iler velto ile ditiu taget

by means of the name K pricectors altimate depths of its Christian

ALL Christological expressions are, like all true theological propositions, confessions of faith. We can never say who Christ is without using expressions which imply the adoption

of a personal attitude towards Him. The Church's Christology begins in the N.T. with two great confessions of faith. The first is that of St. Peter—Ed of a Xprovosia the second is the anonymous confession of the original Christian communities - Kúpios Ingous There i an inner connection between the two, but there are charac-teristic differences also. The first looks to the past. "Thou art the Messiah "—that is, the end, the fulfilment, of the history, a thousand years long, of the prophetic religion. "Jesus is Lord"—with the formulation of this sentence Christian faith begins to leave the Jewish home-land and to run its course through the peoples and religions of the world. The second confession represents an advance upon the first. The Apostolic Togetal Mark viii. 20. E . comot selt in bold to neitromient e es freu

[†] Rom. z. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11 (of. 2 Cor. iv. 5; Col. ii. 6).

experience, the knowledge of the Resurrection of Jesus, lies between. Beyond these two confessions, to which the other Christological expressions of the N.T. are subordinate, nothing more that is essential is said about Christ. There are no discoveries in Christology. The Christology of subsequent ages has no further task beyond the task of understanding more and more deeply the implications of these two confessions.

Kyrios is the Name above all other names which Jesus bears in the Hellenistic communities of primitive Christianity. As the bearer of this name He stands on the side of God, inasmuch as Kyrios is God's holy Name in the LXX. He stands at the same time as a rival, over against all other bearers of the name Kyrios. The name gives expression to His divine rank and majesty. He is invoked as Kyrios in prayer. He has become Kyrios as the result of His Resurrection and Exaltation. He bears the name as being the living and present "Lord," towards whom believers stand in that profound liferelationship which is expressed by the formula ev Xpiorq. His kupierns stands in a specific relation to the life of His enkyota, more especially as that life finds expression in worship. It is a relationship which is experienced more particularly in the κοινωνία which Christians have with Him in the δεῖπνον κυριακόν. The primitive Church thus expresses by means of the name Kyrios the ultimate depths of its Christian faith, and at the same time distinguishes itself sharply in contrast with all other religions.

The origin of this confession of Jesus as Kyrios is one of the most important of the historical problems presented by the study of primitive Christianity. St. Paul found it already in existence before his conversion. Does it go back to Palestinian Christianity? Had the title Kyrios an Aramaic antecedent?

Or are its origins Hellenistic ? Il abrawot shutitta laneriog a lo In Hellenistic linguistic usage Kyrios is employed as a title of rulers, especially for the Roman Cesars, for numerous cult-deities, and in the LXX as a substitute for the Jewish Divine Name. Behind the Greek word lurks an Oriental idea—the thought of an inner connection between Godhead and Kingship. The epithets applied to gods and kings are interchangeable all through the East. Jahve in ancient Israel is called "King," and in later Judaism "King of Kings." The replacement of the name Jahve by Adonai belongs to the same context of ideas. In Aramaic the same process of linguistic development may be followed in the history of the word mare, which occurs twice in the Book of Daniel as a title of the Babylonian world-ruler, and as a designation of God in the forms "Lord of all Kings"† Dan. iv. 16, 21. 2 (6) 11 H .HdT ; 2 Hot Dan. ii) 47. and

and "Lord of heaven." A similar use of the Aramaic mare may be illustrated also from Egypt and Syria. It is a forerunner—if not the forerunner—of the Hellenistic Kúpios in the Aramaic language. In Judaism the use of mare in the religious sense, despite the beginnings of such usage in Daniel and the fact that it occurs apparently already in the Book of Job, † did not become generally prevalent, though it is found occasionally in the Talmud. The Hebrew adonas is not displaced by mare. The Kyrios-idea, then (as it becomes generally evident, wherever we meet with it), is of Oriental origin, Hellenism, by supplying a Greek word which could take the place of a number of different Semitic words, I contributed merely a new and mighty expression to it. Especially characteristic is the use of the title Kyrios for the numerous cultdeities of the period. From Asia Minor, through Syria, and as far as Egypt, there stretches an unbroken chain of evidence for the designation of cult-deities as Kupun. From the East the title was disseminated westwards in the course of the dissemination of the cults. But it was not only these cultdeities who were called Kúpioi. It was not in the capacity of cult-heroes that the title was borne either by Cæsar or by Jahve.

The facts being so, we return to our question whether the primitive Christian Kyrios-title, and the type of piety bound up with it, is to be understood from the point of view of the Hellenistic Kyrios-cults. Our answer runs: The Kyrios-title, as used in the New Testament, can no more be explained from the point of view of the Hellenistic mystery-cults than it can be explained from the LXX or the cult of the Casars. Nevertheless a relationship exists towards these other forms of "Kyrios" faith. Just as the fact that the title assigned to Jesus was the same as the Divine Name of the LXX contributed to an essential modification of emphasis in the Christian faith in the Christ, so the fact that Jesus bore the same title as the Cæsars who were venerated as Divine and as the cult-deities of Hellenism was not without influence on Christology.

In favour of a derivation of the primitive Christian Kyriosconception from Hellenism, it is urged that it is a question of a parallelism which extends not merely to the terminology but to the facts. With the title Kyrios there came into Christianity (it is urged) a type of piety of a kind foreign to Palestinian Christianity and peculiarly characteristic of Hellenistic cults. It was under Hellenistic influences, then, that the original Christian religion assumed the form of a Christcult and of a Christ-mysticism. Such a method of treatment, however, under-estimates the difference between primitive Dan. v. 23. 11 / Job mare, baal.

Christianity as a whole and Hellenistic religion, and overestimates the difference between primitive Hellenistic and primitive Palestinian Christianity.

To describe primitive Christianity as a "Christ-cult" conveys very good sense, if by the statement is meant (with Deissmann) that it is a living type of piety (Frommigkeit) which finds expression in a Church's worship, and not merely a system of doctrine. So again the term may, of course, also be used with the object of bringing clearly before the mind the parallels which actually exist between Christianity and heathenism upon Hellenistic soil, both in the sphere of religious terminology and in the forms of religious social organization, and which point unquestionably to the exercise of an influence upon the new religion by its environment. A "Christ-cult," however, in the same sense as that in which there was an Isis-cult or an Asklepios-cult, never existed. Christ never became a "cult-deity" or "cult-hero." Beside Him and over Him there was always God the Father. The phrase 4662 of warns does not admit of elimination from the worship of the primitive Church. Wherever St. Paul speaks of the Kyrios, he is speaking also, explicitly or implicitly, of the God and Father who has exalted Jesus to the position of Kyrios. The worship of the primitive Church, moreover, never became what the liturgies of the mystery-cults are viz., a drama. Rom. vi. 1 sqq. is not a description, but a figurative interpretation, of Baptism. A further element which the "Christ-cult" lacks is the element of "myth." Why did the ancient world, which gave otherwise so ready a welcome to all forms of Oriental mythology, reject the message of Christ? Surely for the reason that it realized that this message, notwithstanding its mythological traits, this message with its historical core, did not belong to the realm of myth. It is no "necessary truth of reason," but a "contingent truth of history," and for that very reason (from the point of view of antiquity) no truth at all.

The same is true as regards mysticism. The discovery of the New Testament "Christ-mysticism," the interpretation by Deissmann of the formula & Xpioro, represented an achievement which at the time exercised a liberating effect upon New Testament theology. According to the terminology then current, and, indeed, still very commonly used to-day, the description of the type of piety in question as "mysticism" was, moreover, correct. This conception of mysticism cannot, however, be maintained. Mysticism is not a particular side of religion, it is a great religion in itself. It depends on the tenet, held by all the great mystics, of the identity of the human soul, in its deepest nature, with the Divine. Atman is Brahman,

NYM, LOO

σύ γὰρ εἶ έγὰ καὶ έγὰ σύ,* bonus homo est unigenitus filius dei. † This same tenet constitutes also the presupposition of the Hellenistic mystery-cults. It is incapable of being combined with primitive Christianity, in which (notwithstanding the "Christ in me" and the "we in Christ"), the bounds between the Divine and the human are strongly maintained. That is the reason why everyone who attempts (as Bousset has done) to explain primitive Christianity as a cult-mysticism, has to explain away such central ideas of the New Testament as the conceptions of sin, justification, and faith. The misunderstanding is to be explained by the fact that Christianity knows something analogous to mysticism, the truth which appears in mysticism distorted—the reality of the Holy Spirit.

The difference between primitive Christianity and Hellenistic mysticism is the difference between two religions, of which the one can only regard the other as the delusive work of the demons, or as folly. An opposition of this kind does not exclude the possibility of influence, as the history of Israelite religion sufficiently shows, but it renders it a priori improbable that the central conception of Christology, the Kyrios-idea, is Hellenistic in origin.

The Kyrios-idea, as a matter of actual fact, admits perfectly well of being traced back to the Aramaic period of Christianity. Maranatha is an erratic block from that forgotten period which cannot by any theory be set aside. The phrase is evidence that already in Aramaic the word more (a forerunner in other cases also of the Greek κύριος) was used in application to Jesus. In what sense it was used, and in what precise linguistic forms, it is impossible any longer to be sure. It cannot be determined whether the actual confession "Jesus is Lord" had been formulated already in Aramaic. We do know, however, that Jesus was not merely recognized as the future Messiah, but that He was known also as the present and living "Lord," and that He was invoked as "Lord" in prayer. The idea of the presence of Christ in His Community is clearly evidenced by the saying "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them "-a saying which goes back to the Aramaic-speaking, and in all probability, therefore, to the Palestinian, community. T It involves no "Hellenistic mysticism." It is a saying, moreover, which proves that the formula "in the name of Jesus" is to be understood on the basis of Jewish presuppositions. The Palestinian

Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 17.
† Bernhart, Deutsche Mystiker, Band III., Meister Eckart, p. 198.
† Cf. the Jewish saying, "Where two sit together and the words of the Torah are between them, the Shekinah too is among them" (Aboth iii. 2, quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, Komm. z. N.T., 1., p. 94).

Church knew already of prophetic utterances, exorcisms, and miracles "in the name of Jesus," and it is no accident that in the Sermon on the Mount these evidences of the power of Christ in His Church are brought into connection, just as in the Pauline Epistles, with the address to Him as Kúpic.*

This Matthean passage, then, is fully intelligible on the basis of Palestinian relationships to Jesus. Let it once be assumed that—as the New Testament evidence suggests—the original Church of Jerusalem was, like the Hellenistic, a "pneumatic" Church, and the cleavage which we theologians have introduced between them on the ground of our theories about Hellenism disappears at the most important point. No doubt further developments, actual influences from the side of Hellenistic religions, took place: the essential thing, the idea of the living Lord who was present in His Church and who wrought by the power of the Spirit, was there from the beginning. The Eucharist, for example, as it appears in St. Paul, has clearly undergone development, but the experience of fellowship with the living Lord—as witness the story of the disciples at Emmaus—was already involved in the primitive "breaking of the bread."

As to the time at which this earliest faith in Jesus the Lord, of which the scanty notices which have come down to us from the original Aramaic period of Christianity afford only a faint, though a still discernible, picture, originated, the N.T. as a whole bears unanimous witness: it arose out of the deep spiritual experiences of the Easter days. That Jesus was risen and that He was therefore the Lord—that was the content of what, after the analogy of the (confessedly quite different in character) "prophetic" experience, may be described as the "Apostolic" experience. To reach a new understanding of the nature and content of this experience is one of the greatest

tasks of N.T. theology.

Out of the Apostolic experience arose the Apostolic testimony: Jesus is Lord. That was already the Church's confession when Christianity moved out into the arena of Greekspeaking civilization. It was Hellenism, however, which, with the Greek word Kúpios, first contributed to this confession a form of expression which was of historical significance for the world. What was concealed in germ in Maranatha was now unfolded. Now for the first time Christ came into competition with the great powers of the period. Kyrios Jesus: such was the war-cry of the ecclesia militans, to the Jews a blasphemy against the "one only God," to the Greeks a piece of folly, to the Romans a crimen læsæ majestatis, for the Church itself the epitome of its message, its eternal confession of faith.

* Matt. vii. 22 (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4 eqq.).

For ourselves the task is set of understanding afresh this confession of faith in its ultimate depths. As regards this dogmatic task a brief word alone can be said here. The Kyriosproblem is the problem of the Godhead of Christ. That there is a living Christ, not merely in some vague metaphorical sense, but in the full meaning of the words, a Christ to whom His Church prays, and who is in the Church's midst; that this Christ is not an intermediate being, but vere deus, of the same essence with God, and yet a Person over against the Father; and that the unity of God is in no wise affected thereby—these paradoxical positions are implicit in the simple confession of the original Church, directed to Jesus the Lord. The road to the understanding of what the original Church meant by it is never opened out to us, so long as in our dogmatic thinking we take as our starting-point either the nature of God or the person of Christ. The starting-point of our thought must be rather the nature of the Holy Ghost. It is not an accident that the Kyrios-faith in St. Paul leads on directly to the beginnings of the doctrine of the Trinity,* and that it was only in the form of the doctrine of the Trinity that the ancient Church found itself able to express its Christology. The question of the Holy Ghost is the true problem of the theology of to-day, even in dealing with the Christological question. Only when the nature of the Holy Spirit in the N.T. has been clearly discerned, only then shall we escape from the cloud of "religious-historical" hypotheses and be able to reach a general insight into primitive Christianity as a whole, a new understanding of the Resurrection, and so also a new Christology. This is the way of Christian thought corresponding to the way of Christian faith which is indicated by St. Paul in his saying, "No man can call Jesus Lord save in the Holy Ghost,"† a way which the Church understood, since in the Veni Creator Spiritus she sings: Per Te sciamus da Patrem, Noscamus atque Filium. The New Testument use is to be treated back beined Greek

implied more than the recognition of Jesus as "Twicher" oreds tadt bus "iddell "KTRIOE. bro.I mo tadt stoal edt)

Christianity to the designation of Joses in Acameic as Marcos

laider portungiesh a 722 Jvz soll I. Don't brod 'mo" i.o.s)

BY THE REV. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D.

Κύριος means "owner," "lord," "master." As a Divine title in Hellenistic Greek it occurs in the language of particular cults from Asia Minor, Egypt and Syria, in which the gods were called "lords" and their worshippers "slaves." The title was applied also to deified kings, and in Roman times to the old dans of I Cor. xii. 4 agg. vanvlad baide i Cor. xii 3.1 to again

Emperors. In the Semitic world "lord" and "slave" correspond roughly to "master" and "servant"; and an Oriental will speak of a superior as "my lord," and of himself as "thy slave," as a form of politeness. Robertson Smith points out that in Semitic speech when a man is named "slave" of a god, the implication is usually that he is devoted in some special way to his service and worship. The title Kúpios, as applied to a Divine being, may be said, therefore, to have implied power, sovereignty, dominion, and to have suggested, as correlative attitudes on the side of the worshipper, devotion, allegiance and loyalty. A man may, further, owe gratitude to his "lord," and to be the "servant" or "slave" of a powerful "lord" may be a basis of pride (of. κανχῶσθαι ἐν Κυρίφ—1 Cor. i. 31). In the case of such cults as became missionary and recruited adherents irrespective of race or of citizenship, admission to membership in a particular cult-brotherhood implied that the individual so admitted was henceforward under the protection of the divine "lord" of the cult.

In the LXX Kúριος (without the article) is regularly used as a proper name to replace or represent in ; but there are numerous passages—especially those in which Κύριος with the article is used, or in which Κύριος is used with a dependent genitive—in which the appellative sense is unmistakable. The use, moreover, of Κύριος, even without the article, to represent the Divine Name, is significant—it suggests in Greek that the one true God, the God of Israel, who is also the God of the whole earth, and, indeed, of the universe, is appropriately to be thought of as being, in an absolute sense, LORD, sovereigh in majesty and power. The LXX use of the term Κύριος had in the end an important reaction upon the Christological significance of the term in the New Testament; but the New Testament use of the term as a designation of Jesus was not, in the first instance, derived from its Old Testament use.

The New Testament use is to be traced back behind Greek Christianity to the designation of Jesus in Aramaic as Maran (i.e., "our Lord"—cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 22), a designation which implied more than the recognition of Jesus as "Teacher" (the facts that our Lord was called "Rabbi," and that there is evidence from Jewish sources that a Rabbi might be respectfully addressed as "my lord," are irrelevant). That the Messiah might be called "Lord" was to be inferred from the Scriptures (Ps. cx. 1, with which cf. Mark xii. 35-37 and parallels: mari and maran in Aramaic would be the natural equivalents of the Hebrew Psalmist's adom). A "cult-relationship" towards Jesus as "Lord" is already implied, and the beginnings of it go back behind Calvary to the Lord's earthly life,

in which He had been recognized already as Messiah. "Even in Jesus' lifetime," writes Dibelius, "the disciples were personal believers."* The faith of Easter and of Pentecost gave definitive substance and form to this conviction God by an act of Divine power had raised Jesus from the dead and had made Him "both Lord and Messiah." The Psalmist's prophetic words were fulfilled—the Messiah has been enthroned as "Lord" at the right hand of God. In Deissmann's words, the "new

cult" was already "there."

Maran in Greek becomes o Kúpios ημών. The more absolute forms, Κύριος Ίησοῦς, ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, or simply ὁ Κύριος, arise by a slight but natural development. They are essentially "cult titles"; they belong, indeed (to adopt Deissmann's convenient distinction), to the language not merely of "cult," but of "cultus." Thus, Kúpios Ingous in Rom. x. 9 represents probably the confession of faith of a convert at baptism, Kupuakov δείπνον (1 Cor. xi. 20) is a Pauline phrase for the Eucharist, and the Old Testament phrase έπικαλείσθαι τὸ Ιονομα Κυρίου (cf. Joel iii. 5) is used freely in the New Testament of the invocation of the name of the Lord Jesus. The correlative term δούλος is not as a rule used of Christians as such (cf. Gal. iv. 7), ** though St. Paul, on the ground of his peculiar vocation as an Apostle, can describe himself as being in a special sense δούλος Ίησου Χριστού. †† Christians generally are of Enucadovicevor to ovope too Kupiov ήμων Ίησου Χριστού. Τ

The title Kupies, as applied to Jesus in Greek, denotes, therefore, the Divine Lord' in whose name Christian believers assemble, and who is invoked in their worship the Lord in whose name they are baptized \$5 and to whom they "confess with their mouth" their allegiance; the Lord of whose "table" they are partakers in a solemn fellowship-rite, *** instituted by the Lord Jesus Himself, tit a rite which involves "drinking the Lord's cup," tit and which can be described as the "meal of

Cleachichtliche und übergeschichtliche Reisgion und Acts ii. 34.

† Acts ii. 36.

Der neue Kult ist da (A. Deinmann, Paulus, ii., p. 90).

[See Deinmann, op. cit., ii., pp. 90 eg.

[Cf. Acts ii. 21; vii. 60, ir. 14, 21; Rom. z. 12-14; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22; and (with a baptismal reference) Acts xxii. 16 and Jas. ii. 7.

(with a baptismal reference) Acts xxii. 16 and Jas. ii. 7.

Seo, however, Rom. xii. 11, xiv. 18, xvi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 24 and (in special contexts) 1 Cor. vii. 22; Col. iii. 24 (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. i. 9).

Die Junger waren schon bei Lebesiten sichtliche und fibergeschiehtliche Religion

t† Rom. i. 1 (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 5; Gal. i. 10; Phil. i. 1; and similarly Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet.

^{††† 1} Cor. xi. 23.

the Lord,"* in which, moreover, there is a proclamation made of the Lord's death,† and in which to partake unworthily is to be guilty in respect of the "body and blood of the Lord "‡—the Lord who is "rich unto all them that call upon Him,"§ and who through the Spirit is the bestower of "gifts" on His Church. It is in the power of the Holy Spirit that men are enabled to call Jesus "Lord," and Jesus as "Lord" can be addressed in prayer.** As "Lord," moreover, He stands upon an equality with God, and the Old Testament Kúpios texts can be applied to Him. † It is explained by St. Paul that the acknowledged "Lordship" of Jesus is without prejudice to the claims of the Father, since the Father Himself wills such acknowledgment, and has bestowed "the name that is above every name" upon Jesus. ‡‡ In the pagan world there are admittedly "gods many and lords many"; for Christians there is but "one God, the Father," and "one Lord, Jesus Christ."§§

A word or utterance of Jesus is of supreme authority for Christians||||—they are to "remember the words of the Lord Jesus," ¶¶ and to walk in that "way of the Lord" according to which they have been "instructed."*** The title Κύριος thus gives rise to the idea of a lex Christi—the religious and ethical precepts of Jesus are "commandments of the Lord," and the ideal set before converts is that of "life in accordance with the words of the Lord."†† The Sermon on the Mount is conceived, doubtless, by the Evangelist Matthew as a setting forth, by contrast with the precepts given to "them of old time," of the ideal of the New Law, the νόμος βασιλικός (as St. James calls it) which is also the νόμος τέλειος τῆς ἐλευθερίας. 111

In relation to Sacraments, Christ-cult, and Church (the Messiah is naturally "Lord" of the Church), the significance of Kópios has been indicated: and so with regard to the lex Christi. With regard to "Christ-mysticism" a few words may be said. From the time of his baptism onwards a Christian might either be described as having "put on," or be enjoined to "put on," the "Lord Jesus Christ." A man, having been baptized "into Christ," is from henceforth "in Christ"; and there is, according to the New Testament, a mutual indwelling between Christ and His members. With the phrase & Xριστῷ, which sometimes denotes this relationship of mutual indwelling, the

^{* 1} Cor. xi. 20. † 1 Cor. xi. 26. † 1 Cor. xi. 27. § Rom. x. 12. || 1 Cor. xii. 4-5 (cf. Eph. iv. 8). † 1 Cor. xii. 3. ** Acts vii. 59-60; 2 Cor. xii. 8. † Cf. (e.g.) Rom. x. 13; Acts ii. 21; Phil. ii. 9-11; Heb. i. 10 sqq. † Phil. ii. 9-11. §§ 1 Cor. viii. 6. ||| 1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14; and contrast 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25. || Acts xx. 35. ** Acts xviii. 25. †† J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, pp. 56 sqq. \$\$\$ Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. iii. 27.

phrase ἐν Κυρίφ (which is of frequent occurrence) is formally parallel. It does not, however, appear to me to be a particularly "mystical" phrase. It need mean no more than "in the Christian sphere of relationships,"* or (in some contexts) "in the service of the Lord";† "to be ev Kupiw" is, in effect, simply "to be a Christian." In itself the term Kúpios, in so far as it retains its meaning as "Lord," is not favourable to mysticism, if by the term "mysticism" be meant a type of religion in which personal distinctions are, or tend to be, blurred. The Kúpios - δούλος relationship is one which moves wholly within the sphere of the "I and thou" type of religion. conspicated problems arise-distorical and literary criticism have guide elear both the manifold diversity of His content of

was meterically and temporally conditioned. How when it serve as a north, when A O A N A T A M .. C geneous or coherent?

ideas, and also the far-reaching manner in which His outlook

vilnostib a osla belibabe w vollkath dimilib barrol sid of of substances the difficulty, so commonly meged, of the post-

persentent of the Parousia which Lad been seconfidently expected This paper will be concerned mainly with Jesus' own testimony to Himself and with the teaching of the Apostles. A number of problems in Systematic Theology, however, are involved also-problems concerned, in the first instance, with the connexion between Faith and Hope, and especially with the grounds of this connexion. There are three possible cases:

(1) Hope may arise as the logical conclusion of a particular outlook upon the universe as a whole (as in the Babylonian,

Buddhist, and Parsee religions).

But Hope may also arise—
(2) as the product of faith in a living God, who reveals Himself in concrete historical events (Israelite and Jewish

religion); and

(3) the hope of an inheritance, the hope of a universal sifting, separation, and fulfilment, is intelligible by reference to the specific relationship of sonship to God, or to the relation of a community (Church) to Christ, its Founder and Lord (as

in the Christian religion).

All these attempts serve to establish an Eschatology; it is no mere product of fantasy or arbitrary imagination, it is an essential element in a general conception—the natural outgrowth of a cosmology, a theology, or a soteriology. Especially does experience in the present involve a specific hope as regards the future.

^{*} Rom. xvi. 2, 8, 13; Eph. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 29; 1 Thess. v. 12.
† Rom. xvi. 12, 22; 1 Cor. xv. 58; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Eph. vi. 21.
† Rom. xvi. 11.

In any attempt of this kind to find grounds for an Eschatology, dialectical problems arise with regard to its systematic development-problems concerned with the relation of time to eternity, of "this world" to "that world," of history to that which is super-historical, of the universe to God. There are further questions also, questions concerned with the significance of Eschatology for the interpretation of Christianity generally, and especially for Christian Ethics (the "radically eschatological" interpretation of Christianity, and the theory of Interimsethik). In the end, moreover, so soon as the words of Jesus are recognized as the basis of Christian hope, the most complicated problems arise historical and literary criticism have made clear both the manifold diversity of His content of ideas, and also the far-reaching manner in which His outlook was historically and temporally conditioned. How can it serve as a norm, when it was not itself homogeneous or coherent? To this formal difficulty there must be added also a difficulty of substance—the difficulty, so commonly urged, of the postponement of the Parousia which had been so confidently expected as close at hand!

There is, finally, a fundamental problem which in this connexion arises afresh—the question of the legitimacy of the appeal which is here made to authority, the problem (in other words) of the "Word" in relation to matters of faith.

of this commercian. There are three preside cakes: (t) Hope your screenes the Head constant of a particular

The eschatological sayings of Jesus presuppose the "hope of Israel," and claim to inaugurate its fulfilment (Luke iv. 21). Side by side, however, with this element of fulfilment there appears also a renewed element of promise. In the Sermon on the Mount, in the parables, and in other sayings Jesus refers to a coming "day" of requital, judgment, and glorification of the righteous (Matt. vii. 22, xiii. 41, xvi. 27). The expected world-history will be full of misery and distress, but in the meanwhile the Word goes forth to all nations, until in the end there ensues—as the sequel of a period of catastrophe, crisis, and stress—the world-judgment and the gathering of the elect. Jesus, however, proclaims this anticipated End as the day of His own Parousia. The framework and setting of the eschatological picture—the conceptions of judgment, resurrection, and kingdom of God—were traditional. The announcement of His own second coming in glory was the thing which was specifically new. This bold concentration upon His own person appears unexampled; but such a self-consciousness on the part of Jesus becomes credible in view of the fact that it is a manifestation

not of presumption but of humility, which knows itself only as the agent of the sovereignty of God, of obedience towards the Father, by whom all things are given over to Him; and of love, that is ready to serve and to suffer. As faith, at the present time, has to orientate itself towards Jesus, so also, as regards hope for the future, it is Jesus who stands at the central point of the coming events. As to the "when," there is no clear information conveyed by His sayings. His day is near (Matt. xvi. 28), but He delays also (Matt. xxiv. 48, xxv. 5; Luke xix. 12 sqq.). A corollary is the warning injunction: "Watch!"

(Matt. xxv. 13; Luke xii. 35).

The preaching of the Apostles exhibits similarly a great variety; but here also the essential outlook, which governs and constitutes its richness, is the same the expected Parousia of the Christ (2 Thess. i. 7, ii. 8; Rom. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 10; Acts xvii. 30; Phil. iii. 20 sq.; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 13; Apoc. xix. 15, xiv. 16 sqq.). The coming of the Lord is the goal of worldhistory. For Paul, who on one occasion refers to a saying of Jesus (1 Thess. iv. 15), all hope appears to rest actually upon the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 14). Every circumstance of the life of the Church in Corinth is considered by him from the eschatological point of view.* Worship, too, is considered in the light of the future (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 26: "till He come"); so Christians are to observe the Lord's Supper as a manifestation of their fellowship with the returning Lord. The longing for Him finds expression in the Aramaic Maranatha (1 Cor. xvi. 22), a liturgical formula which has been retained in the most ancient known Eucharistic prayer (Didache z. 6), and which corresponds to the closing words of the Apocalypse (Apoczonanie 20) Prayer for the Parousia united primitive Christianity. Life and doctrine depend on the preaching of Jesus; they find their culmination in the expectation of His return, an expectation which is at once the reflection of Jesus' own consciousness of His mission and the expression of the iversality of His claim to dominion. In this sense the Parousia-expectation is to be theologically emphasized even to-dayne more rest 's state state state of a test test ' bas " won " brider smoltablestress out or many or alteriordistant shows and lieur

It is significant, as regards the present situation, that the "last things" have once more become a matter of first importance. Eschatology has become the decisive point of orientation for the understanding of Christianity, a kind of theological "first principle." Modern theology appears, indeed, at times to be absorbed by the eschatological circle of ideas to the exclu-* See Karl Barth, Die Auferstehung der Toten (1924).

sion of everything else! A doctrine of the "last things" must, however, in any case be concerned with the Parousia as the central Event which is promised. It forms the conclusion of a chequered course of world-history, in which the Kingdom of God has unfolded itself, but in which contradiction and hostility have grown up no less; and it constitutes the manifest victory of the Christ, which in its turn marks the end of a history full of manifold conflicts, the beginning of peace, the inauguration of a new phase of the Kingdom of God. The systematic exposition of all this must do justice both to the concreteness of the Parousia as an event, and also to the specifically dramatic character which belongs to it. how to make the production of

I lay stress upon the first of these points in opposition to the kind of idealizing abstraction which would reduce everything that is pictorial in the Parousia-language to the level of a merely non-significant façon de penser; as against this, it is necessary to emphasize the moment of visibility in the event. Christ appears. He who was concealed becomes manifest. He is no longer

merely proclaimed, He is seen as organism, (on with ason I 1) award.

The second essential point the dramatic character of the Parousia—is indicated in the phrase "from thence He shall come." It is a question of His Coming. We do not go to Him: He comes to us. Wherever the Parousia is interpreted as the equivalent of the eternal presence of the Christ who is unseen, a religious motif (belief in the Real Presence) no doubt decisively operates. Where, however, the Parousia is understood only in the sense of a super-historical present fact, to the exclusion of a Coming of Christ as the term of world-history, there Christian

hopelis cut shortly abrow zaisolo out of abanquerdo deidw bas Christian hope depends neither upon a postulate nor upon the conclusion of a syllogism: it rests solely upon the promise of Christ. Especially, however, does the dramatic character of the promised event continually impel the theologian to a peretually renewed criticism of the dialectical machinery which irst erects an opposition out of an antithesis, makes difference out of distinctions, and exaggerates the distance between "now" and "not yet" into an acute state of tension, and then proceeds rhythmically to resolve the contradictions which itself has created. Or again, it is the business of theology first of all to examine and consider carefully all possible categories of thought (spatial, temporal, metaphysical) with a view to their possible utility, to test them in respect of their applicability, in face of the historical fact that Eternity did once enter time, that the Divine did appear in a human birth, and (in the present context) more especially with reference to the word of promise, on which Christian Eschatology rests.

olf but esourceton lesigniet Who instructed neizenaos of Ter All our spiritual possessions in the present and the future our whole faith and hope, rest on the Word. Christians, however, are "doers" of the Word, and not hearers only. They are "called"; and the call involves a vocation, the relationship in which they stand towards Christ involves a corresponding behaviour; they are to "shew forth the praises of Him who hath called "them (1 Pet. ii. 9). They are "strangers and pilgrims" (1 Pet. ii. 11); but, bound by the word of their Lord, they are free from the world. Their life and their work stand in the light of the Lord who shall come. If this state of things is to be described by the term "Interimsethik," that does not mean that their work is deprived of its value. On the day of the Parousia they will be found to be of those who have made use of their talents. The Lord assigns them tasks which are capable of being accomplished (Mark ix. 41), and promises His reward for them. His word summons them to service unto the Kingdom of God, and such results of their work are expected as shall be able to stand at the Judgment and be well-pleasing to God.

The fact that the Word of life must not, and cannot, be made of none effect as the result of the inevitable criticism of the actual form of its text, is a thesis which can here only be suggested, not developed at length. The subject of the Word of God, its Scriptural form and its scientific criticism, would be an extremely "live" theme for a future discussion. bux deed The Mary (from or Property

IV. THE DISCUSSIONS IN RETROSPECT

(a) The Historical Problems.

SURVEY, WRITTEN AT THE REQUEST OF THE CONFERENCE

at tend self tenent of L' By HEINBICH FRICK an boilded mo atter la amadores bos mistal (ABBRIVIAND) repolerant) in topque of

Our subject was worded: "The Christological Heritage of the Primitive Period and its Significance for Today." The first great impression, shared by us all, was that of the immense range opened up for our contemplation by such a subject. Significant of this is the fact that there was a great mass of material and of problems which could only be lightly touched upon, not discussed, still less solved, in the course of our Conference. The following topics were in this sense mentioned, without being expressly handled, in our discussions: (a) Questions of method, as for example—

The connexion between christological utterances and the living fellowship of faith with Jesus Christ.

The negative or positive character of christological

formulæ.

The relation of theological Christology to non-theological utterances about Jesus.

The terminological applicability of modern ideas such as "mysticism," "cult," "solidarity," etc.

The nature of Christology in relation to the nature of ree from the world. Their life and their work stand-sangue

(b) Important material themes which remained virtually undiscussed such as

The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Jesus Christ as Pleroma Windom Logos Jesus Christ as Pleroma, Wisdom, Logos.

Corpus Christi (Church and sacrament).

The Lord and the Spirit.

Christology and Monotheism.

Christology and the modern conception of the universe.

Jesus Christ and the world of religious

Jesus Christ and the world of religious.

The two lists could be easily enlarged without going beyond what was said in the discussions. Out of the inexhaustible wealth of the material and of the problems the following ideas clearly emerged in the course of our sessions.

'Hre "theme for a furne discIston.

visuaritie as ed bluow anxiolities editacion si bas acroi bernicire

THE MAIN GROUP OF PROBLEMS

(a) The Historical Problems.

The papers prepared before the Conference began, and now published, formed the basis of our discussions. In conformity with our general theme, they are concerned predominantly with our biblical and historical inheritance from the past in respect of Christology. Biblical and historical problems of Christology were therefore prominently raised also in the discussions. Since, however, the reader has before him, included in this number of THEOLOGY, the British and German papers in an unabridged form, no more than a reference is here needful.

(b) The Bible and later Confessions of Faith, more especially the Definition of Chalcedon.

1. It was recognized generally that our christological heritage from the earliest days of Christianity stands in a great context, in relation to which it must accordingly be understood. Just as the Christology of the New Testament stands in a context which refers back towards Judaism and the Old Testament, so also it stands in connexion forwards with the

theology of the Church and of the Creeds.

2. This recognition involves the adoption of a positive attitude both towards our christological heritage from the earliest days and from the past generally, and also towards the scientific work which has been done by many generations of scholars in relation to this heritage. On the one hand it would be acknowledged by us all that there is a transparent and significant connexion between Old Testament, New Testament, and ancient credal confessions of faith: it is a question, all through, of one and the same thing. The question would be raised at this point of the peculiar connexion between the Old Testament and the New (Jesus the Messiah). On the other hand all were agreed that here no mechanical equations could be made. Loyalty to truth makes it necessary for us, in taking account of the essential unity in the thing, to take account also of the great differences which have arisen out of the specific function of each expression in relation to its corresponding historical context (e.g., in relation to a particular phase of culture). The relation between the Christology of primitive Christianity and that of the ancient ecclemastica confessions of faith would be especially before us at this point and add doidy lo di

3. It would be acknowledged thankfully by us all that we owe gratitude, among the voices which speak to us out of the past, both to those who simply utter their faith and to those who are seeking rather to sift and test the tradition. Fundamentally we are agreed that christological work must be pursued in this double sense—at once confessional and critical.

The results, however, of such work depend essentially upon which leitmotif is uppermost. At this point considerable differences between us emerge, which have their essential roots in the historical background of our respective groups. By this we do not mean national differences, but the question rather: In relation to which of the phenomena of history do the respective confessional types orientate themselves? There is a difference here between the German Lutherans and the Anglican theologians, but christological lines of division run no less on the German side between Lutherans and Reformed, and on the British side between Anglican and Free Church theologians.

- (c) The Christological Significance of Martin Luther and of the Reformation Doctrine of JUSTIFICATIO SOLA FIDE.
- 1. Without rejecting the ancient ecclesiastical confessions of faith, Martin Luther nevertheless discovered afresh the line of approach to the Christology of primitive times from a specifically different angle-namely, that of soteriology. This had, and still has, an immense influence not merely upon German theology but also upon that of a great deal of non-German Protestantism. From this point of view the re-discovery of the Gospel at the time of the Reformation constituted a turningpoint also for Christology. Bible and confessions of faith were interpreted in the light of the new doctrine of salvation (justiicatio sola fide). In practice those groups who have connexions, direct or indirect, with Luther hark back essentially in their Christology to the New Testament, and estimate the significance of the ecclesiastical confessions of faith only in so far as they perform the service of safeguarding the biblical heritage against fundamental errors. It was an asure of vilavoil .shelir od
- 2. The representatives of this tendency who were present at the Conference were quite clear in their own minds that in making a special appeal to the mission of Luther they were far from importing into their Christology a point of view determined merely by national or historical circumstances or by anything like hero-worship for Luther himself. On the contrary it is their unanimous conviction that as a result of the Reformation a perspective was secured, in the light of which the Christology which shall be "actual" at the present day can and must be worked out.

(d) The Christological Inheritance of the Church of England.

1. A second group of theologians, whose point of view found expression in the discussion, draws its strength from other historical sources than those characteristic of the theologians to whom reference has been made under sub-heading (c). Both the course of the English Reformation and the revival of patristic studies in the nineteenth century have brought it about that theological thought on this side readily orientates itself to the ancient ecclesiastical confessions of faith. When it was perceived, therefore, by the representatives of this group that "Lutheranizing" theologians were impelled to attack christological problems directly and predominantly from the point of view of soteriology, their impression was that from their own side the approach to Christology was not of necessity along this avenue. Not of course as though they were obliged to leave soteriology on one side. On the contrary: whatever may have often been

the case in the past, the British participants in the Conference emphasized without exception the importance of soteriology. Their difference from the "Lutheranizing" type lay rather in the following direction—they were disposed to advocate a Christology based on the idea of the Incarnation or of the Logos-doctrine, in the course of which they developed sequences of ideas which could hardly be expected from a Lutheran theologian. Some of the Anglican theologians drew attention especially to the significance attaching to the eucharistic Christ and to His presence in the Church, the corpus Christi.

2. It must be expressly said with regard to the Anglican group also that it was not merely as the result of historical circumstances or of other false prejudice that they were led thus to defend a specific christological perspective. It emerged clearly from their unanimous testimony that their decisive interest was directed towards making "actual" for the present the christological inheritance of the past. Both the general structure of theology and the many-sided needs of the generation of men now living are alike kept clearly and strongly in view from the Anglican side, but they are approached in the light of Christology. In the fust piace, the two lites of accident by no morning

They should not a second will consent the contract the first transfer of THE TWO CENTRAL CHRISTOLOGICAL QUESTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

1. The material presented in the papers, taken in connexion with the group of problems sketched under the heading I., gave rise, as may be imagined, to a many-sided series of discussions. Nevertheless, in the course of the Conference two problems in particular came more and more into the foreground, so that in retrospect these two central questions appear like the two

foci of an ellipse.

XVII. 100

The first problem is the question of the relation between the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history, the question so impressively treated by Martin Kähler (among others) in his famous work, Der sogennante historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus (1892; 2nd edition, 1896). The attempt was made in the discussions, by all who took part in them, to hold together two points of view. On the one hand there is the relativism which clings to all historical reality and all historical tradition—a relativism which in Christology must be taken with special seriousness, since the genuine manhood of Jesus Christ is under no circumstances and by no artifice to be taken out of that realm of questioning, scepticism, and tension to which everything historical and earthly belongs. Theology must

envisage the person, sayings, and work of Jesus as being entirely immersed in this actual world of ours, with all its tension and all its perplexity. And yet, side by side with this also, the actual fact of the historical occurrence of the decisive revelation in Jesus Christ! This means that once upon a time, there "outside the gates of Jerusalem," something actually happened, that the traditions as to the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus denote something which actually occurred, and oblige us therefore to affirm, in opposition to all our doubts, a divinelyordained historical realism, and to commit ourselves to an existential judgment, an ontological affirmation, about something that "once" happened. To the sense of strain involved by the tension between these two lines of thought members of the Conference gave repeated expression with a deep feeling of responsibility, and it was recognized by them all as a strain which it was incumbent upon the theological conscience to bear. the chaircelegical inhacijances of the post-proposition of

2. In the course of the Conference it became more and more clear that the antithesis between the two typical conceptions of Christology sketched above under headings I. (c) and (d) must form a second focus of discussion.

In the first place, the two lines of treatment by no means exclude one another. Just as personally those who took part in the Conference were without exception anxious to learn from the other side, and recognize gratefully the enrichment which has come to them as the result of their common work, so also in actual fact there are strong positive relations between the two Christologies. It may indeed be said that each of the two lines of treatment needs to be completed by the other, if regard be paid to what Dr. Mozley had in view when he said: "A certain danger inherent in the Lutheran type, the danger of seeing only soteriology, might be obviated by the recognition of the objective, collective, and universal elements which are found characteristically in Anglicanism; a certain danger in Anglicanism, the danger of neglecting soteriology, might be obviated by a steadier cultivation of the central ideas of Lutheranism, with their true paradox of judgment and grace, with their richlycontrasted quickening of daily-renewed penitence and faith." This was, of course, not meant as a cheap synthesis, but as the expression of a feeling which prevailed in the Conference generally, of which something more must be said in the next

3. It must, however, at the same time be made clear that the aspiration after a comprehensive Christology could not be the last word as regards the antithesis between the two sides. Those who took part in the Conference were conscious rather of

this antithesis as being still in process of emerging, perhaps indeed only in the initial stage of so doing. The real task lies still before us. We are not in a position to regard the matter as though the two main forms of Christology referred to could be simply combined without friction. That is impossible, at least at the present stage of discussion. The duty of theological candour compels us to say openly that the theologians whose orientation is Lutheran must hesitate, on deep-rooted grounds, to follow the Anglican train of thought as regards the eucharistic Christ and the corpus Christi. And the Anglican group must hesitate equally, upon conscientions grounds, to endorse simply and without more ado the Lutheran soteriological type of Christology.

Rather are we conscious of being strongly impelled to the further investigation of this problem IN COMMON; and we see in this impulsion the main result of the Conference.

4. Our work was orientated towards what we have inherited from primitive Christianity and from history generally. It would be to leave unsaid something absolutely essential if we were to omit to say that the Conference was fully conscious of standing before the question of questions, the question of God, which is laid here and now at this present time upon the conscience of every one of us. Our experience was that the more we attempted to speak in modern terms about God, the more we were driven back upon the testimony of the Apostles and Fathers; and conversely, the more carefully we tried to enter into their testimony, the more were we impelled to attempt to translate our christological heritage into the speech of the generation of those who are living today.

We return then to the starting-point of this narrative: all christological thinking only has meaning in so far as we hear Jesus Christ's question addressed in all its sharpness to us: "What think ye of Christ?" What and Whom, what fact do we actually mean, when we speak of the Incarnation, of the Cross, and of Easter, and then venture to take upon our lips the incredible confession of faith that this Jesus is one with God?

2. By THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY

ore so he could despit some transferred that the could be a first of the could be

tiberal type-and for some on consens and a firm topy landed

per most frequently translated income the land the land to the

THE Conference of English and German theologians which proved so successful at Canterbury last year has just been repeated in Germany. The meeting-place was the Wartburg, near Eisenach in Thuringia; a castle high up on a wooded hill, rich in beauty, in history and in religious as well as musical

associations. Here St. Elizabeth lived at the beginning of the thirteenth century; and here Martin Luther, as a prisoner in 1520, translated the New Testament. It is a great centre of pilgrimage, and all day long modern pilgrims were to be seen, young and old, children and students, with knapsacks and coloured caps, climbing the steps or gathering in the courtyard,

on their way up to the Palace or the Chapel.

The members of the Conference assembled on Saturday, August 11, and were given a cordial welcome by the Church and the civic representatives of Eisenach. Indeed, a word must be said forthwith in gratitude for the hospitality which surrounded us. Our special thanks are due to the Landesoberpfarrer of Thuringia (Dr. Reichardt), the Hauptburgomeister of Eisenach, Herr Cranach, the governor of the castle, Herr Stier of Weimar, Dr. Stoltenhof from the Rhineland, and above all to our untiring and courteous host, Professor Adolf Deissmann, President of the Theological Commission of the Stockholm

Conference, and to his wife.

Of the original group Professor Stahlin, Dr. Selwyn, Professor Dodd and Mr. Oldham were absent; and their places were taken by Pfarrer H. Sassé (of Berlin), Canon J. M. Creed and Professor N. Micklem. Professor Deissmann was present for the first time, and took the chair. In addition Professor Aulen of Lund joined the party, with a view to a conference on similar lines in Sweden; while Archbishop Söderblom of Upsala, Dr. Reichardt and Pastor Le Seur attended as guests. As before, the meetings had the advantage of a religious background. A simple opening service was held in the Wartburg Chapel on the Sunday, with a sermon by the Landesoberpfarrer. Every morning prayers were said, also in the Chapel; and on the Friday night, August 17, the Conference concluded with the singing of a chorale in the same place and the playing of Einfeste Burg from the Castle, as the Cross shone out into the night.

This year the subject was Christology, a theme deliberately selected at Canterbury. And it is, I think, important at once to emphasize a point of which the religious public in England is hardly aware. German theology has often been of a very liberal type—and for some reason or other this type has been most frequently translated into English. But it has been by no means the only or the most important type. Many German scholars are themselves disturbed at this misconception by English students. And it was plainly evident from the debates that not only had there always been a powerful stream of conservative teaching in the German theological schools, but that the theology which was most influential among those represented by the German members of these two Conferences

was decisively on the orthodox side. The appended list of books, prepared for me by one of the Lutheran professors, will show this tendency clearly enough. It is much to be wished that at least one or two might be translated into English.

The papers printed in THEOLOGY, on subheadings of the main theme, had been prepared in advance; and, the reader will observe, they reflect both agreement and difference. But, as before at Canterbury, it was the difference and agreement which emerged in the debate which proved most interesting and significant. And the co-operation in discussion was all the easier and swifter as it started on the basis of the friendship and understanding already created. Dr. Deissmann from time to time contributed some admirable guiding thoughts to the Conference as its chairman; and Archbishop Söderblom on two occasions at least drew on his store of learning to illustrate the absolute character of the Christian Revelation in history and by comparison with other religions. But the main burden of the debate was borne, and rightly borne, by the younger theologians, whose average age, it will be remembered from last year, was about forty. The form of their arguments might well recall the contests of the schools: there was such system, such earnestness, such countering in debate, such challenge in question, and such charitable pungency in reply. The immensity of the subject was felt by all—and however searchingly some sides of it were probed, much, very much, remained that was hardly touched. Certain main convictions and lines of thought clearly emerged; and if I mention them without the kindling atmosphere of the discussion it must not be supposed that they are either in fact platitudes or cold, lifeless phrases. For example, all were of one mind that Christology was a study of vital importance; and let it not be forgotten that, whatever may be the case with ourselves, this could not have been assumed in Germany twenty years ago. And we in England may well remind the public (which loves smooth reading) if not one another, that there is a great gulf fixed between the modern journalist-biographer's sentimental interest in Jesus as the hero of heroes and personal acceptance of Him as the Christ. Further, Christology was set forth as dependent on an attitude of soul, and bound up with worship. However much light (it was urged) a purely scientific study might throw on departments of the subject, it could not reach the core: for Christology must be a "reflection upon being seized by Christ." Another fact on which great stress was laid was the importance of "the historical approach." This was brought out in deeply interesting ways by several of the debaters. The real Jesus of history must, they argued, be the Christ revealed in the Bible, prepared for in the Old Testament and seen in the New, and worshipped by the disciples. The "scandal" of the Gospel, as it was vividly expressed by Dr. Schmidt and Dr. Kittel, was that Christ had appeared on the historical scene at all. Not only could He not be abstracted from history (as Hermann abstracted Him) but the very crux and treasure of the Gospel consisted in His irruption into an historical context. In other words, not only did it miss the whole point of the New Testament narrative to say with some, "If only Jesus had not claimed to be the Messiah!" but Jesus and His claims could not be understood apart from the whole Biblical context of the Messianic hope. The Biblical language was still that best suited for the exposition of the Saviour's claims to-day. It was frankly confessed that the "historical approach" had grave difficulties of its own—that it was like going along the edge of a knife-but it was asserted to be fundamental.

It would take too long to attempt even a summary of what, in addition to the above, seemed the most important or the most vigorously expounded propositions of this theological week. Nor can the cold print of an article reproduce the impression made by the hours of strenuous and earnest debate. How, for example, could I let the readers of this paper see (and hear) Dr. Mozley, after applauding much of Dr. Althaus' splendid discourse on Forgiveness and Judgment, begin the peroration of his own deeply felt address with the words, "Has Althaus said everything? NO"? But one or two further matters of particular interest ought to be remarked. It was noted that patristic theology had a far greater influence in England than in Germany; and that the Christological interest in this country found a natural focus in discussion of "the two natures" theory and the Creed of Chalcedon. And during the debate some striking things were said by Anglican, Congregationalist and Lutheran on Chalcedon and its meaning for to-day. All were "friendly to Chalcedon," to quote the phrase of one member. "There are no substitutes," said another. But to the German theologians, while admitting that the Fathers were important (as St. Bernard and St. Augustine were to Luther), it was the Reformation that was epoch-making for Christology, from the point of view of our own times. Luther had declared that it was "forgiveness of sins" which was divine: and the Reformation by emphasizing this, and by making justification by faith the starting-point, had done a work for theology itself to which English scholars paid far too little regard. The Reformation itself, they maintained, was dynamic, not static; and one great deed, perhaps the greatest deed, which it had chieved was the proving in experience and thought alike that Christ was Saviour, that the supreme meaning of the Incarnation was soteriological. Such was the claim that the Lutheran members of the Conference pressed, and, put as they put it, their plea made a marked impression on the rest, though it was forcibly pointed out on the Anglican side that there was a danger of individualism, and that, while Anglicans must certainly remember that Incarnation was not the same thing as Atonement but required Atonement, the Lutherans must in their turn recollect that Atonement meant not individual for-

giveness alone but world-wide redemption.

It may be asked whether there was any Anglican claim with regard to Christology which made an equal impression on the Lutheran professors. There can be no doubt at all as to the reply. The Lutherans were moved, and moved profoundly, by the contention advanced by some of the Anglicans and, above all, in two masterly speeches by Dr. Rawlinson, that Christ could not be fully understood apart from the Eucharist. It was urged that the devotion to Christ as Redeemer in the Eucharist was full of significance for theology. The Sacrament was set forth as itself a great sermon of gratia sola. The Last Supper was asserted to be something much more than table-fellowship. even with the Messiah. And the question was asked whether St. Paul had not been inspired to call the Church Corpus Christi by the Eucharistic associations which Corpus Christi already possessed. The Anglican supporters of this contention did not, of course, claim that they had the classical Anglican theologians behind them; and this point was emphasized by Canon Creed from a different angle. On the contrary, they acknowledged that it had only in quite recent years come powerfully to the front in a section of the Church, and was in fact a line of division between the older and more traditional Anglo-Catholic movement and the modern. For the present purpose it is sufficient to say that the contention, novel to them, aroused great interest among the Lutherans, who were eager for opportunities of a more extended kind to pursue the matter further. Lane 02 decomposed Proposed placed between

Enough has now been said, I hope, to give some idea of the vitality and freshness of our proceedings. Of course, much was left out of the Conference itself—and it was certainly interesting to note the little reference made to the Logos doctrine or the Wisdom literature. Yet a notable collaboration was achieved on some of the most important Christological problems. And there can be no doubt that everybody who took part left the Wartburg both stimulated and enriched. Plans are on foot for a continuation of this co-operation in theological study;

and it is hoped that a book on the Doctrine of Christ, to which both the English and the German members will contribute essays from their different points of view, will be issued in due course. A further Conference on a related subject is to be held in 1930 in England.

a new out their often construct out of G. K. A. Bell. danger of individualism; and that, while Aughora anathericars

Levisivibor this structure groups with their toollown fruit rivil LIST OF GERMAN BOOKS RECOMMENDED ON CHRISTOLOGY AND KINDRED SUBJECTS

en anielf omse wit tore win insiturarmel teat rishermen vers

casterior required out amontoners being being per toe traumant

KARL HERE: Glaube und Leben. 2nd ed. 1928. (600 pp.)* Furche Verlag, Berlin.

KARL Hunt: Die Weltanschauung des Bibel. (100 pp.) Deichert, Leipzig.

KARL Hunt: Oswald Spengler und der Christianismus. (100 pp.) Beck, Munich.

Carl. Brunner: Der Mittler. 1927. (500 pp.) J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen.

ALOLPHE SCHLATTER: Geschichte des Christus. (400 pp.) Vereinsbuchhandlung. Stuttgart.

R. Bultmann: Jesus. 1926. Deutsche Bücherei, Berlin.

MARTIN KARHLER: Dogmatische Zeitfragen. 1st ed., vol. ii. Deichert, Leipzig.

MARTIN KARRLER: Der sogenannte Historicale Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus. (200 pp.) Deichert, Leipzig.

E. Hirstn: Jesus Christus der Herr. 1926. Van den Loeck u. Ruprecht, Gottingen.

K. BABTH: Dogmatik I. 1927. Chr. Kaiser, Munich.

HERMANN MANDAL: Christliche Versohnungslehre. 1914. (300 pp.)

CARL STANGE: Die Wahrheit des Christusglarbens. 1914. (200 pp.) Deichert,

FRIEDRICH GOGARTEN: Ich glaube an den dreienigen Gott. 1926. E. Diederiths. Jena.

PAUL ALTHAUS: Die letzten Dinge. 3rd ed. 1926. (300 pp.) Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. FERDINAND KATTENBUSCH: Die deutsche evangelische Theologie seit Schleiermacher.
4th ed. (200 pp.) Föpelmann, Giessen.

EICH SCHAEDER: Theozentrische Theologie. 3rd ed. 1928. 2 vols. Deichert, Leipzig.

HARS WILHELM SCHMIDT: Zeit und Ewigkeit. 1926. (300 pp.) Bertelsmann, Gittersloh.

GOODLE OF THE STATE OF THE JOURNALS WE SEE THE STATE OF SAME THE SAME THE

Topics office with accommittee out provide decided form beginn Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie. (Editors: Althaus, Hirsch, Stange.) Annual subscription 20 marks. Quarterly, 200 pp. each issue. Bertelsmann, Gütersleh. Zwischen den Zeiten. (Editors: Barth, Gogarten, Thumeysen.) 20 marks (?) per annum. Chr. Kaiser, Munich.

Theologische Blatter. (Editor, K. L. Schmidt.) Monthly, 8.40 marks per annum. J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig.

The number of pages is approximate only in each case.

this cours real distriction success or

badvious tars batchmuits star publical

esitanogo-on esit la acitamostaco a rai

thereases. Net a natable collegement as a way a constant

V.—1. THE INAUGURAL SERMON

(ABBEVIATED)

By Dr. REICHARDT, CHIEF PASTOR OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH IN THURINGIA

Remember them that had the rule over you (your teachers, Germ. Trans.), which spake unto you the word of God; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith (Heb. xiii. 7).

During the next few days theologians of different lands will meet together in order that they may work towards a common understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. To these days this hour is the quiet and solemn preparation. This castle of the Wartburg, praised alike in song and legend, has been selected as the place of meeting. How many figures of the past meet us here! The counts of the Middle Ages who ruled this land of Thuringia; the singers gathered from the valleys of Germany to compete in the renowned battle of song; and, not least, Elizabeth, famed for her tender care over the sick and the poor. But for every evangelical Christian, one figure overtops all others—the man Dr. Martin Luther. Never can he be separated from the Wartburg, for it was from this castle he sent forth his greatest gift to the German people, nay more to the whole Christian world—the translation of the New Testament.

Remember your teachers. So reads the text. The world is quick to forget. Our age forgets of set purpose, and intends to sever the threads which bind us to the past. A new generation, it is said, must carve out a new world by its own power unencumbered by the weight of tradition and history. Let the world so think and act, and the future will judge. But we in the Church must not and cannot so act. The elemental power of Luther again thrusts itself into the midst of our German theology; once more his works are edited, read, and understood. This is a sign of our recovery. Luther has still something to say, not only to us Germans, but to all Evangelicals of all

countries who are the product of the Reformation. Some years ago a German historian published a work entitled, Luther as a Man in History and as Symbol. Let us also thus doubly think of him. Luther as a man in history. I would remind you of but two scenes from his life. . . . (Here followed a description of Luther in the Wartburg.) In the loneliness of the castle the great man found no inner peace, for his spirit was troubled and his soul moved to its depths. Here he was attacked by doubts. He writes from the Wartburg: "A thousand devils hurl themselves against me in my solitude." The unity of the Church tears his mind and heart. He asks himself whether he can be justified in breaking this unity. "Art thou the only wise man? Is it possible that all others have erred and have erred so long? What if thou hast wandered out of the way, and art leading others astray, so that both thee and they will be damned eternally?" Thus it rang in his ears. He sought firm ground for his feet, a rock upon which he could set the new fellowship in faith. Here in the Wartburg he found this rock.

There across the way in the tiny Luther-chamber, which is still so impressive, he began the labour which provided the ground upon which he and his whole work could stand firm. It is characteristic that most German artists represent Luther with the Bible in his hand. Thus he stands in Worms, so also down below in our city of Eisenach, so too he was seen by the Swiss poet:

"Er fühlt der Zeiten ungeheuren Bruch
Und fest umklammert er sein Bibelbuch."

(He felt the times were ghastly bent,
And firmly clasped his Testament.)

Day and night were spent in translating the New Testament. The magnitude of the work absorbed him, and his sense of lone-liness left him. To pay but one visit to the spot where such a work was achieved is surely to possess a memory and an enrichment for the whole of a man's life.

That is Luther on the Wartburg. There he struggled and wrestled, but there also he taught and proclaimed the Word of God. Remember your teachers, which spake unto you the word of God says our text, and it adds, considering the issue of their life. I would also remind you of the issue of Luther's life.

(Here followed a description of the death of Luther.)

But Luther is also a symbol. The text concludes with the words imitate their faith. We need in our day the mighty example of this man's faith. It is strange how similar in many respects our time is to the period of the Reformation. It is a time heaving with thought. New questions and problems arise. What is old crumbles away, what is new bursts forth; and it is hard to see what will emerge from it all. Mighty caverns yawn before the intellectual as well as the spiritual life, and men of culture feel strongly that this age is an age of chaos. All the busy questioning of men is once again set loose, and new solutions are set before us. And not the least of these questions is the problem of the Being of God. After the storm of the last decades this remains the question of questions, and it rises before us in all its magnitude. The question never allows us to rest; it demands an answer. But the answer lies beyond our power. He alone can give the answer, He who is the answer of God to the questioning of men-Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and for ever up ad and and redded w Heamid exten off . treed

Then it is that our eye turns once again to him who here in the Wartburg, after great struggling, completed his work. The misery of mankind, sin and guilt, cast him to the ground. His human search for God found nowhere an answer, not even in his Church. And yet the "I" cried in the dark for the "Thou," until the answer came to meet him from far and yet so near. I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me. All that fierce struggle to attain God and a new life was thereby judged and delivered: by grace,

through Christ, blessed.

The Reformation Churches have proceeded along different roads. They have, for this reason, never attained unity. For this unity we are now searching. When in the lectures and conversations of today the Person of Jesus Christ stands in the centre, the beginning and goal of union is perhaps given. We are concerned with this as the main question. In the past it was an evil thing that only isolated sayings of Jesus were dealt with, or views concerning His Person. Man-made doctrines were constructed, which, because they were too human, divided men from one another. This was certainly not according to the will of Jesus. He wished His disciples to be one, to form one Body of which He is the Head. In his life Luther did not seem always to have shown the will to such unity, but his faith declares to us where this unity is to be found: in Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer. This faith we must follow, even in our day. Just in so far as we seek not our own glory, but give glory to His Name alone, will the Spirit of God teach us to overlook what divides us in order that the unity of the Spirit may be once more restored through the bond of peace. Thus only can the divisions which exist in the Churches of the Gospel be bridged—but this is no human work, it must be wrought by the Spirit of God. Let is pray for the coming of the Holy Ghost.

We stand under the influence of the old castle of Luther, and our thoughts are drawn to his memory. On the staircase leading to the Luther-chamber there is written a saying of Luther's: "Let no one fail to believe that God intends to do a deed through him." Though we are not such as to compare ourselves with Luther or our deeds with his, yet we ought to have something of this courageous faith, when we work for the union of the Churches of the Reformation. Let us not fail to believe that this work must be done. It is the will of God. And in this work may God give us His blessing. Let us therefore remember Luther according to the words of the Apostle: Remember your teachers, which spake unto you the word of God; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith.

Then it is that our ever farms some arguin to him who here

2. MEDITATION ON MATT. XXII, 41-46

nove for research of Br PAUL ALTHAUS and desine a mind sill

mile for the hour at their (ABBREVIATED) by Date ... decent) and an

"Though" until the answer country according to the front from ter and yet WHAT think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? Jesus Himself puts the question. His question gives us the reason and the justification of our Conference. It is not left to our discretion whether we will look for a Christology or not: His question compels us to answer. Not caprice, not curiosity, but simple obedience to the question which he puts, leads to Christology. Before we ask, He asks.

His question, however, has all the seriousness of the questions which he puts at other times. It has the seriousness of God's question to us. The same Jesus Christ, who knows nothing but the Father's name, kingdom, and will, who wishes for nothing but God's sovereignty, the same Jesus asks: What think ye of Christ? A generation ago this phrase was current in theology: "Not the Son, but the Father belongs to the Gospel, as Jesus preached it." And many confessed that they were sick to death of Christology, and yearning for God. As if the question about Christ was not, in fact, the question about God! Just because Jesus wishes for nothing but that the Father should be known and honoured, He asks, What think ye of Christ? By knowing Christ rightly or not, we decide for or against obedience to God. For the question about Jesus is not a problem for the scribes, but a decisive question which claims the whole man, not less seriously than when He stands before the rich young man or speaks the great words about God and Mammon—it goes together with these decisive questions.

accombate and all from more aid at armost one analytical runs have But our text reminds us not only of what kind the christological question is, but it gives us also our direction for the answer. The Jewish wisdom of the scribes has the answer ready to the Messianic question: the Messiah is David's son. Jesus calls the answer in question. For this answer means: Israel knows beforehand what must happen to the Messiah; Israel has a programme, certainly not without foundation in the Divine promises—a programme in which all longing for freedom is expressed. With this picture of the expected Messiah they compare the coming man, and take him to the Cross. Is it not the same with us as with Israel? We approach the Lord with our longings and expectations and questions of redemption: He must give peace, moral strength, international union, etc. Now Jesus does not say simply "No" to all this. He will be indeed sometime the fulfiller of all longing, the deliverer from all need: "He puts an end to all our need!" But before He is the Son of David, He is the Son of God. All programmes and human fancy pictures are shattered. We obtain fulfilment in no other way than that we wait upon God, who is greater than our heart. No human category contains Him and His salvation, none constrains Him. He who will speak rightly about Christ cannot describe and compare Him on the basis of human needs and ideals (David's son), but must know Christ as the Son of Him whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts. But will He not give peace? Certainly. And yet what we understand and claim as peace, that must first meet with the "No" of God. From God peace obtains its content: Christ does not get His standard and value from our peace. . . . Amen. copies dain breaks for an end when the rest to present and present

3. MEDITATION ON MATT. IX. 35-38

By KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

ABBREVIATED) . THE MANUEL OF THE STATE OF TH

Who is able to exhaust the meaning of the classical christological passage in the Epistle to the Philippians (chap. ii.), where the world-encompassing Christ-drams, which joins heaven to earth, and holds together the past, the present, and the future,

Some say that the Gospels, and especially the first three Gospels with their many isolated simple sayings and their separate stories, will aid us in unravelling the problem. Certainly it ought to be so. It would, however, be a serious mistake to imagine that the student of Christology, who is busied with the significance of Christ for the Church and for theology, has nothing else to do than to order the isolated sayings and stories, and thus to build up the history and character of Jesus, as though they were capable of psychological understanding, and as though He could be fitted into the period in which He lived. A theologian, who has critically investigated and vividly described the story of the making of the successive "Lives of Jesus" with their scraps of knowledge and their Albert Schweitzer.

great mistakes, destroys our confidence in such an historical undertaking. He complains that the respectable Life-of-Jesus-Theology has set a human, psychological, supplementary mowledge in the place of a God-given reality. Many radical commentators, who in their day were not listened to because they destroyed many cherished opinions,* have uttered similar warnings, as did many representatives of an older generation who were employed on specifically theological work.† Thus warned and directed the newer study of the Gospels emphasizes, it is true, the importance of the isolated sayings and narratives, and the importance of the different sections of the narrative; but in so doing it is fully aware that what is isolated must be understood from the whole, and that it is the christological theme of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians which is reflected in the Gospels in a series of detached pictures. In the history of Jesus each single fragment directs us to His appearance as a whole. This or that saying—yes, even all His teaching—might have been spoken by another teacher and prophet; but here there speaks One who is endowed with unique authority. This or that action—yes, all His actions—could have been done by another worker of miracles; but here acts One who stands within the breaking forth of the kingdom of God, which is realized in Him. For this reason He forgives sins, and for this reason we stand before each separate story of Jesus with the question, Who can exhaust its meaning?

In Jesus of Nazareth the Christ appeared as Teacher and Prophet, as the Saviour and Good Shepherd, as the Lord sent by the Lord God. This is high Christology, not gnostic speculation. It is confession, not myth. This Christ became man, as we are; He was the Friend of His people, and became our Brother. The sons of men, who suffer both internal and external suffering, are taught and healed by Him. The distressed and scattered sheep are cared for by Him. And where does Christ meet His brothers? There where men serve and love their brother men. Yes, the high Christology of which we have heard is one with the apostolic warning, Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. There is precisely the work; and the harvest is gigantically abundant. May the Lord God send us the true workers; may He use us as the true workers. Amen.

"Lives of Jesses" with their country of knowledge and their

Assertable Cattle & Street Street Street Street

Julius Wellhausen and William Wrede.

† Martin Kähler and Adolf Schlatter,

4. MEDITATION ON JOHN VI. 60-69

mere thought that there could be a read which led away from

set of the son this but By GERHARDT KITTEL! to do the tradition

STRIP this double confession of the triviality, almost banality, with which we have clothed it, and we stand trembling before its tremendous might. Thou hast the words of eternal life and Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. Who can make this confession?

The whole pathos of the primitive Christian confession of faith in Christ lies in this twofold Thou art and Thou hast. Primitive Christianity knows nothing of a soteriology and of a Christology, as though they were capable of separation. It neither could nor would speak of the mystery of the Logos and His oùoía, except as the mystery of Him who came to save the world, to make sinners blessed, to give the Word of Life: that is to say, with their eyes turned towards soteriology. Nor could it speak of this gift without confessing Thou art. The reality of the Christology is the only guarantee that the "Word" is more than a sound which dies away, however much it be longed for. Only what the Son is justifies the claim that He has.

We tremble before the double confession. It brings us to the cross-roads. It demands Yes or No. It is a hard saying, and is intended to be a hard saying. Jesus permits no one to pass by in harmless and comfortable fashion, and He certainly permits no one lightly and without contradiction to have a little talk about Christology. How piercingly His eye rests upon us; and upon us theologians it is markedly fixed. Doth this cause you to stumble? Then follows that appalling verse, in which it is said that many of His disciples henceforth went back, and walked no more with Him. We theologians again know something of the horror of that word many.

But yet, there are also those who did not go back! Why did they not? Before the great confession of Peter there is inserted something else: the little word whither? What brings him to a decision between going away and walking with him? Is it the solemnity of an atmosphere of devotion? Is it the sanctity of an honourable formula? Is it that creative act of the human spirit—a notable theology? No, in that whither of Peter there rings something utterly different. There is voiced a hot and passionate despair. Whither shall we go? This man does not measure whether it were more expedient, more right, to go away or to remain. He is horrified in the depth of his being at the

不够强。 有公的

mere thought that there could be a road which led away from Him. This whither is the cry of complete homelessness and absence of comfort. This man knows that there is never and nowhere any other place of peace possible for him, not in the wide world, not among men, and not in his own breast.

Upon this background grows We have believed and know. This trembling whither leads to the rapturous bravery of the

confession.

5. MEDITATION ON 1 COR. I. 21-25

By DR. HEINRICH FRICK

(ABBREVIATED)

DEAR FRIENDS! The life of man lies in the blood. Only when it flows in living streams from the heart does our body remain healthy and strong. Our brain also needs, in order to be able to work, the warm heart-beat from the centre of the whole organism. And what we know of the body is no less true of our mental and spiritual being.

Many a time it seems almost as if we rolled stones before the door of the tomb with our Christologies, and held the Living One fast in the narrow prison of our ideas. That was the case with Paul before his Damascus, the theologian Saul from the school of Gamaliel. As such he had at his disposal a Christology, even the most venerable, which can be thought of before the appearance of Jesus, the Christology of the Old Covenant. Mighty thoughts about the Messiah, as much in regard to Israel as in relation to the whole world, were working in the fanatic Saul. They culminated in the dominant idea of the divine power, which was to become visible in the promised Redeemer. But what was the consequence of this sublime Christology? It barred the way to the true Messiah of God, Jesus of Nazareth. For he hung on the Cross, and looked more like a caricature, a scornful mockery of that Messianology than its fulfilment. Therefore: away with this criminal to the gallows!

And there were the Greeks; Wisdom was to them the highest category, with which they thought of conceiving the human and the divine. What would the message mean to them of a certain Jew, who was proclaimed as world-saviour by uneducated people from the East? When one of them dared to speak of the resurrection from the dead and the last judgment on the Areopagus at Athens, they could only laugh at such foolish-

ness. And has it not remained so up to the present day? Fancy pictures and dreamy aspirations have again and again, when they were applied to Jesus or even came in contact with Him, hidden Him from view rather than revealed Him. Every nation, every century, every civilization has its favourite thoughts. And in like manner every one of us. But we bury Him ever afresh, especially when we think that we possess the highest categories. Then we do not point to Him, but to ourselves, our tradition, our understanding, our profound thoughts.

But He remains buried under all this.

Till He breaks forth one day with power! That is what made Paul out of Saul, even in his theological thought. We can trace that still in the words of our text. In them the Damascus of Paul, his Easter, finds an echo. As he soars up with strong flight of thought from the ideals of the Jews and the Greeks to the offence and folly of the Cross, in order to praise at last the divine power and wisdom, we are reminded of the bold elevation which so many a painter has put into his picture of the Risen One. He flings aside the stone which closed the tomb by the force of His appearance. So Christ breaks through the venerable traditions and categories of the Jews and Greeks, revolutionizing the life and thought of the Apostle in like manner.

6. CONCLUDING MEDITATION UPON PHIL. II. 5-11

BY NATHAN SÖDERBLOM, ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Paul here describes the two last acts of the World-Drams. The last act is entitled: In the name of Jesus all knees will be bowed, and all tongues will confess Him. But that which the Apostle selects as most noteworthy in the history of the world is for us incomparably the most important act: Obedience, the Death on the Cross, Victory. The earlier acts may be here mentioned shortly.

Ι.

The eternal Spirit by an act of His will caused the world in which we live and move and have our being to be brought into being. The true reality of the whole world is therefore Spirit; and yet we cannot decide which in actual fact more nearly approximates to that reality: the multicoloured Universe perceived by our senses, or this same Universe extended, as modern science explains to us, in the vastness of the planetary systems or in the minuteness of atoms and electrons—the whole a continuous mechanical movement.

П.

Then He caused life, the mystery of life, to emerge in this world, and from this life a movement which does not proceed upon mathematical lines, but which follows haphazard the animal instincts.

III.

At last it pleased the eternal God to create for this Universe an eye, capable of perceiving this world, a heart in which eternity dwells. Through a divine self-communication, as never before, there was apportioned to men something of the Ruach, the

Spirit of Eternity.

But even this sharing in the life of God, this communicated self-determination, brought with it fatal possibilities. Man made use of it to his own hurt. The riddle of evil, the terrible mystery and power of darkness, the brutal reality of sin and guilt deprived mankind of its true destiny; and we all share in this condemnation. If anyone believes that he can dissociate himself from this solidarity of wickedness and world-evil, he dwells in illusion.

IV

But when the time was fulfilled, God in his unfathomable counsel willed to bring in the fourth period of His Self-communication, the highest, the unique Self-communication. It pleased His very Love, through His eternal Wisdom, through His Logos, through His thoughts of Love binding together creation and salvation, to enter personally into history within the human family. In Jesus Christ the eternal Word of the Father abode bodily among us, full of grace and truth, bringing into being for mankind doomed to destruction a new creative beginning. In the New Testament the Incarnation of the Logos, the creative and saving thought of God, is described in three stages.

(a) The Logos, the Word, became flesh. His glory became visible as the glory of the Son begotten of the Father, full of

grace and truth.

But the miracle of the Incarnation did not consist in its visibility. It was already present in the womb of Mary. As the ability, development, history, genius of a man, cannot be explained by his education, surroundings, method of life and experiences, but its origin must be sought in his mother's womb, so, and much more so, it was with Christ. The miracle of His appearance lay already in the womb of Mary. What was born of her was unique and supernatural in the history of the world. He was in the form of God. In this man there was the divine Nature.

(b) But, and it is second—otherwise we cannot speak of Incarnation—with this being in the form of God is linked indissolubly what Paul here narrates: although He was in the form of God, He counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God.

This humiliation is integral to the Incarnation. Apart from the form of a servant, the Incarnation would have remained incomplete—yes, it would have remained ineffectual. He could not have merely assumed an ideal humanity; it was necessary for Him to enter into the conditions of real humanity. He was no ideal man. He was no collection of virtues. He was passionate, ruthless, not at all an unruffled and detached wise man.

(c) Paul is not satisfied even with this form of a servant. which links Him to other men, and by which He entered into relationship with them. Paul advances an important step further, and says, thirdly, that Christ was obedient unto death, even unto the death on the cross. Chantepie de la Saussaye is fond of saying that we (Lutherans) possess a theology of Redemption, and our Anglican brothers have a theology of Incarnation. I would add that this is due to the fact that Anglicans are more familiar with the Greek Fathers than are other Western theologians. But the distinction is obviously only relative, since Incarnation apart from Redemption is unthinkable—both belong inevitably together. The human family, because of the corruption and decay wrought by sin and evil, lacks the purity and glory intended by the Creator. A real Incarnation must therefore enter deeply into the conditions of human life and share in the most dire results of sin and condemnation. For this reason the glory of Him who was born into the world appears in the most miserable and horrible form conceivable, in the martyred and bloodstained body of a brutally punished criminal. Only thus is the Incarnation of Christ made perfect and effectual.

ts

e

d

b, is

m

d.

ne

The Apostle continues with the final act of the history of mankind—the Exaltation. What the Apostle claimed as sober fact has become true. A name was given to the Saviour above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow. What the Apostle wrote from his prison in Rome concerning the worship of Jesus Christ which arose in an obscure corner of the world, was at that time so great a paradox that it must have seemed either ridiculous or madness: Every tongue confess Him Lord? Every knee in heaven and on earth and under the earth bow at the name of Jesus of Nazareth? Such

an idea might rise in the excited brain of a Jew; and yet it has

become true, and will become even more true.

But whence arose the unique power and majesty of the Saviour? How can such a miracle have come into being? We must never forget that, however reverently and devotionally with all our powers and with all our experience of Christianity we may have considered and spoken of the Incarnation during the past week, the Apostle derives the victory and unique power of Jesus, not from the Incarnation in the womb of Mary, but from the σκάνδαλον of His form of a servant and from His Passion. His glory rests upon His fidelity in humiliation and from His suffering and obedience unto death. For this reason God exalted Him. The glory of the Incarnation is inseparable from the form of a servant and from the humiliation. A Presence of Jesus in the form of God without humiliation and without the death on the cross is entirely foreign to Christianity—is a dream.

NVI with an eldow out of the man

In 1 Cor. xv. 24-28, the Apostle develops further the last act of the World-Drama.

My brothers, shall we be present then? That is for us the main problem of Christology. In the solidarity of wickedness and evil we have our rich share. Shall we also share in the

victorious procession of the Servant of God?

Chantegal of de Sameone

The Apostle does not present us with a play, in order that we might wonder at it in awe and worship. He ruthlessly strikes home, and exhorts us to have the same mind which was also in Christ Jesus. If we are to have our part in Him, we must act as He did, not looking each one of us to his own things, but also to the things of others. Faction or vainglory must be removed far from us. Love, compassion, service and humility, being of one accord and of one mind—these are the things which unite us in a communion of salvation with the Incarnate One. Unity, the unity of Christians, is not something which we can gain or lose according to our theological or ecclesiastical position or point of view. A real and spiritual unity belongs to the very profession of Christianity. If we have the same love, then we must be of one mind. The Incarnation, which was perfected upon the cross, must be perfected upon the cross, that our selfishness may be destroyed and that the mind of Him who was incarnate may master us. Only in this manner does the Incarnation in the suffering and victorious form of a servant attain its purpose. Only thus can we have a part in the blessed work of Him who was incarnate. Have we this mind, which was also in Christ? That is for each one of us the Christological Problem. Amen.

REVIEW

continues the continues.

TOWN HOUSE

ESSAYS ON THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION. By members of the Anglican Communion. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. Pp. ix+415. 21s.

Dogmatic theology is a region in which scholars and divines of the Church of England have long been at home, and in which they have done much notable work. The tradition goes back at least as far as the great chapters beginning with the fiftyfirst in the fifth book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. There we have dogmatics and history of dogma combined, and that has, on the whole, been characteristic of Anglican scholarship in this field. On the purely historical side its labours have been less impressive, especially if we are looking for works which give more than a study of particular subjects. Yet, even here, Dr. Bethune-Baker supplied an Introduction which, within the limits of its survey, could stand a comparison with Von Harnack or Loofs or Tixeront. And of valuable monographs illuminating some section of the area of dogmatic thought and controversy we have an increasing number.

It is to dogmatics as containing, but passing beyond, history of dogma that Dr. Rawlinson and his colleagues have now made a contribution of great importance and value. This is a book rich in learning, many-sided, well-equipped on critical issues, and definitely constructive in aim and tendency. And at points where roads diverge, leading to radically differing doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, there, so far as I can judge, the right road is taken. Those who believe that the classical Catholic tradition conserves and expresses Christian truth will find these essays harmonious with their belief and a support to it. This conclusion is not weakened by sharp disagreement which may be felt in matters which are not of the nature of

unimportant detail.

But there is one serious omission in the book. In his essay Dr. Kirk says that "adoptionism, or indeed any doctrine of a purely human Jesus, is flatly contrary to the presuppositions of this book," a statement approved by Dr. Rawlinson in his introduction as meaning that Christ is not "ultimately less than divine." It is surprising that throughout the book no serious attention is given to the kind of position now to be associated with the name of Dr. Bethune-Baker, which, in effect, denies the appropriateness of any such phrase as "a purely human Jesus." In his Edinburgh Review article, "Evolution and a New Theology," the Cambridge Professor contrasted the old Christology constructed by theologians "obsessed by the logical

antithesis of Man and God" with the kind of doctrine which the evolutionist theology emphasizes. And that, as the article shows, amounts to a doctrine of progressive incarnation in humanity, supremely revealed in Jesus. "If," he writes, "Incarnation be the right term to use to describe the facts about Him, then it is right to say that in Him God was manifested in the world more plainly than before. . . ." It would be unfair to say that this issue is wholly ignored in the present volume. Part of Professor Hodgson's essay bears upon it. But it is not directly faced and handled, and that I cannot but regard as very unfortunate.

I

The volume divides itself into three sections, concerned respectively with Biblical theology and the religious environment of early Christianity, with history of doctrine, and with problems of metaphysics and of speculative Christology. Dr. Rawlinson leads off with an article entitled "Hebraic Theism as presupposed by the Christian Movement." As a survey of Hebraic religion it is remarkably compressed; it illuminates what it touches, and appeals to a mere amateur in the subject of which it treats as exceedingly competent. There is no unbalanced emphasis on the work of the Prophets. Dr. Rawlinson ignores the importance neither of Moses nor of the religion of the Law. The section on the character of God in the Old Testament, a subject which lends itself to much foolish talking on the part of persons whose acquaintance with the Old Testament often seems that of comparative strangers, is admirable. The necessity of the element of awe in man's approach to God is wisely emphasized. And over a good deal of facile writing about God today might be inscribed, as a serious warning, Dr. Rawlinson's epigram, "When the gods are domesticated, religion dies. The Hebrews never committed the error of domesticating Yahweh." The conclusion of the article is that Judaism "was a religion of expectation. It looked ever forward to the coming redemption of God's people."

Mr. Narborough follows with an essay on "The Christ." It is mainly concerned with the Synoptic testimony to our Lord's sense of vocation, and especially develops the idea of "Servant-Messiahship." Mr. Narborough argues that the prophetic conception of the Servant, combined with passages in the Synoptic record, suggests that our Lord looked forward to the conversion of the Gentiles as resulting from His redemptive sufferings, and that His conception of Himself as the suffering Servant, along with His use of the hundred and tenth psalm, involved the idea of the priesthood of Messiah manifested in the offering of His life. There is, as Mr. Narborough realizes, a

good deal of reading between the lines in this interpretation, and I think he is fanciful when he sees in our Lord's mention of the sign of Jonah the suggestion that "Jesus, the servant of God, would become through death the converting power among the Gentiles." At the same time, the thorough-going way in which he applies the conception of the Servant in connection both with the earlier and the later phase of Christ's ministry results in a very interesting delineation of the character of the

ministry. The picture, as a whole, is not overdrawn.

To Mr. Narborough's article Mr. A. D. Nock, the one Cambridge contributor, appends "A Note on the Resurrection," in which the points of difference between pagan stories of divine resurrection and Christian belief in the resurrection of Christare briefly indicated. The argument contrasting the Christian observance of Easter with pagan observance of annual festivals, and indicating the relation of festival to belief in the contrasted observances, appears to me to be lacking in logic; it is certainly expressed very obscurely. But there is nothing obscure in Mr. Nock's discussion of "Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic background," the longest essay in the book. Only a reviewer who had worked over the ground of Hellenistic religion could do justice to Mr. Nock's great learning and possess the right to support or contest his conclusions. One can but hope that through Mr. Nock's researches the popular mind will gradually be awakened to the knowledge that there are weighty objections, dependent not on theory but on fact, to the assimilation of primitive Christianity to one of the "mystery-religions" of that era. This applies with special, though not exclusive, force to the rites of baptism and the eucharist. As to the question of Dominical institution, Mr. Nock holds that, in any case, the supposition of such institution was inevitable. He continues: "This admission should not disturb the orthodox. If the community was guided by the Spirit, they were doing the will of the Founder. What modern study does shake is the conception of Christianity as a piece of clockwork wound up once for all and set to run." -above inclinate to military many

tombile estandos combos Of the two historico-dogmatic articles, the first, by Dr. Kirk, deals with "The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity." He sets himself to answer two questions, whether the Christian facts involve us in a belief in "the multiple personality of the Godhead," and, specifically, in a belief " in three persons, rather than in two or four or, say, a dozen," and whether, if multiple personality be accepted, without special ground for accepting the number three, it can be shown "that this latter factorthe threeness of the Godhead-entered Christianity from some alien source. . . ." Dr. Kirk criticizes effectively the grounds which have been alleged by Usener, Archbishop Söderblom, and other scholars for the Trinitarian character of Christian belief. The distinction he draws between the Christian doctrine of a Trinity of "persons" or "hypostases" within the Godhead which is a unity and triads of associated divinities is much to the point. On the other hand, I am doubtful as to the empirical grounds of belief in the "three persons within the one Godhead" which he adduces, and still more as to the stress which he lays on this fortification of belief. However much we may recognize "three distinct activities of the Godhead towards ourselves" (and here I think the "threeness" very difficult to justify), "each sufficiently universal to be the expression of a whole personality summed up in one activity," existing contemporaneously and continuously, it would seem that this would give us "empirical support for a belief in three persons in one Godhead," only if it were not possible to conceive of such activities as existing side by side in a unipersonal God. Is such a conception impossible? If it is possible, how can we deny its possible truth? Moreover, how does this distinctness of the activities which impels us to think of a person at the end, as it were, of each activity, tally with Hilary's doctrine of the circumincessio, as expounded by Mr. Green in the essay which succeeds Dr. Kirk's? That Christian experience had its place in connection with the primitive notions of Trinitarian doctrine is undeniable, and Christian experience remains consonant with the doctrine, but Dr. Kirk's argument needs restating.

A consideration of the witness first of Judaism then of Paganism brings Dr. Kirk to the New Testament. Special interest attaches to his examination of the evidence for a "binitarian" as well as for a Trinitarian strain in the New Testament. That there were pre-Christian tendencies in a binitarian direction Dr. Kirk's pages make clear; but despite binitarian formulæ to which Dr. Kirk points, for instance, at the beginning of St. Paul's letters, I find it hard to believe that there was ever any serious possibility of a binitarian doctrine of God. St. Paul, pace some modern scholars, did not identify the exalted Christ and the Spirit; he did think of the Spirit as belonging to the sphere of Divine reality. And though certain texts taken by themselves would suggest that the Spirit was an influence not a hypostasis, there are others which are decisive against any such idea. Dr. Kirk is, of course, far from overlooking all that makes up the corpus of New Testament Trinitarianism. But he thinks that within the New Testament the matter is not decided; the writers "had not fully made up

their minds whether they would interpret Christianity in a binitarian or trinitarian sense." I do not suppose that the writers had fully turned their minds to the question of interpretation. But the conjoining of the Spirit with God and Christ in a way in which no other person or thing is conjoined with God and Christ means that in the New Testament the victory of Trinitarianism is not only anticipated but present. In so far as this is the case, our judgment of Dr. Kirk's conception of "a struggle between a binitarian and trinitarian interpretation of the Christian facts," maintaining itself "for nearly four centuries," will be affected. But, apart from the New Testament, such a reading of the course of dogmatic development is highly criticizable. "Struggle" is a misleading word. Moreover, in so far as anything like binitarianism emerges it does so as a doctrine of two Gods. It was impossible that such a doctrine should succeed. And when the conviction of the divine unity exercised its proper influence, then it became inevitable that the Holy Spirit should be included within the unity of the Godhead. One associated in the sacred writings with the Father and the Son could not be an inferior divinity. Monotheism taken seriously along with the New Testament could lead to only one result—the doctrine of the Trinity. It did take some three centuries for the definitive conclusion to be reached, and there were all kinds of oddities of thought and expression to which Dr. Kirk very fairly draws attention. But a real possibility of a Christian binitarianism—that I cannot see at any moment in the process. Dr. Kirk has raised, in this connexion, a question more interesting than really important. But a critical attitude at this point must not outweigh appreciative recognition of Dr. Kirk's labours. The last two sections of his article on "The Trinity of Philosophy" and "The Trinity of Experience" are much to be admired. The argument from experience is here presented more carefully and safely than in the earlier pages.

Mr. Green's essay on "The Later Development of the Doctrine of the Trinity" is one of the ablest and most attractive pieces of work in the volume. It is also one which raises a number of highly controversial points for the student of dogma, and the limits of a review would not allow of anything like a full statement of the grounds for divergence from some of Mr. Green's conclusions. After a suggestive statement of possible approaches to "the problem presented by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity" along the lines of a pluralistic conception of reality, or with "the unity of God, the Absolute" as the starting-point, or in accordance with Professor Pringle-Pattison's notion of a "timeless yet unfolding God," Mr. Green passes to a dis-

cussion of "Alexandria and the doctrine of God of God," to which succeed sections on the theology of Antioch, on St. Athanasius and Rome, and on the Cappadocian Fathers. His pages present a picture of an evolution of true Trinitarian doctrine through Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian (on one side of his thought), Paul of Samosata, Dionysius of Rome and Athanasius to a point where the genius of Augustine could expound the doctrine in such a way as to do justice to the essential unity of God and the reality of the Trinity. Over against this process of development Mr. Green sees the Alexandrines and the Cappadocians never able to disentangle themselves from pluralism, to reach an adequate conception of the divine unity, or to find a real place in the Godhead for the Holy Spirit. It will be simplest if I say briefly where Mr. Green's case does not appear

to me convincing. First, I am not happy as to his solution of the terminological difficulties. He tells us that Athanasius disposed of the idea of two Gods "one subordinate to the other" by the assertion that "though apparently two, God and Christ were in reality One; Christ is of one substance (homoousios) with Almighty God, that is, identical with God in being." Later on, he points to the fact that the Nicene Fathers identified οὐσία and ὑπόστασις and clearly holds that by ovoía they meant "actual individual being" and not "generic existence." But if ὁμοούσιος at Nicæa meant one in actual individual being, then it is difficult to see how any kind of idea of personal distinctions within the Godhead was or could be preserved, and, so far from the introduction of the term meaning "that the Creed of Nicsea was not so much a victory but a compromise "-in itself a paradoxical view which the quotation from Bishop Robertson does not justify—the Origenistic tradition suffered a complete defeat, through the difficulty of finding a place for any kind of real duality. Again, Mr. Green's treatment of Tertullian is of doubtful validity. There is for him a pluralistic Tertullian conceiving of the substance or being of God as shared by three subjects, and a Tertullian who appears "with a wholly economic conception of the Trinity." This is the true Tertullian, who is always consistent in holding that "the unity of God is a unity of 'substance': and 'substance' for Tertullian, as for Paul or for Athanasius, meant one thing and one thing only-viz., concrete individual being." Mr. Green gives us Tertullian's well-known distinction between substantia and natura. Yet on a later page, writing of the Cappadocian Fathers, he can say that "it is characteristic of these Fathers to use ousia, as Tertullian before them had used substantia, in the sense of essence or nature, in which more than one may share, and to

keep hypostasis for the real existence of an individual being." But we may remember that it was not the "true" Tertullian who spoke in this way. Now, no one would pretend that the whole of Tertullian's thought and language is self-consistent; but that admission is quite different from the postulation of a "true" Tertullian, for whom substantia always meant "concrete individual being." It is certainly very curious that the doctrine both of the "true" and of the other Tertullian is mainly drawn out and exemplified from the treatise adversus Prazean. Moreover, the difficulties which emerge from Mr. Green's pages are not lessened by his use of the terms "pluralistic" and "economic." For him "economic" very definitely does not mean Sabellian. Dr. Morgan, the author of the latest English monograph on Tertullian, who agrees with Mr. Green that for Tertullian substantia means "individual substance in the concrete sense," uses the term "economic" to describe that doctrine of the Trinity, found in one part of the adversus Praxean, which Mr. Green calls "pluralistic."

Next, Mr. Green seems to me to do less than justice to Origen and, besides him, to the whole Alexandrine School, and to be too favourable to Paul of Samosata. While he recognizes the Trinitarian element in Origen's thought, he asserts that "Origen himself was no trinitarian in his more fundamental view." He emphasizes to an extreme Origen's conception of the distinction of the Son from the Father, and ignores the many passages (e.g., in Ev. Joh., x. 32; in Lev. hom., xiii. 4; in Num. hom., xii. 1) which point towards the possibility of Origen having accepted and used the homoousion formula. And when Mr. Green is interpreting the Alexandrine Dionysius he is not a safe guide. Dionysius, he says, "refused point blank to use the expression homoousies of the relation of the Logos to the Father." But the testimony of Dionysius himself in Athanasius' De Sent. Dionysii by no means accords with this sweeping judgment. Dionysius says that it is untrue that he has denied Christ to be homoousios with God. He had avoided the word as not contained in Scripture, he had not dissented from its meaning. Athanasius has no doubt that Dionysius is on his side. That these two great Alexandrines gave precisely the same meaning to oµoovoros is not to be maintained, but that is very far from justifying Mr. Green in his contention that the orthodoxy of Alexandria before Athanasius was "pluralistic or even tritheistic" in character. As to Paul of Samosata, Mr. Green holds that Paul did use the term homoousies of the relation of the Logos to God. Though he was condemned at Antioch, his doctrine of the one ousia or hypostasis was established at Nicesa. Paul regarded the The single services of the service services and the services of the services o

Logos "as eternally involved in the being of God, and coming into what we may perhaps call personal existence for the purpose of the divine self-communication." For the bad doctrinal repute of Paul Mr. Green regards the Alexandrine bishops, who condemned him, as largely responsible. But if one dissents from Mr. Green's criticisms of Alexandrine theology, one will hesitate to allow that the condemnation of Paul by Origenistic bishops is, in effect, a testimony to his orthodoxy. Nor do I think Mr. Green's note on the "very dull" Christology of Paul at all happy. His Christology was important, it is difficult to regard it as orthodox—Mr. Green allows that he may be accused of Christological heresy—and the fourth-century Fathers who thought of Paul as a heretic on the Trinitarian as well as on the Christological issue may not have wholly missed the facts.

Finally, Mr. Green, while rightly full of appreciation of the grandeur of Trinitarian theism manifested in the doctrine of Augustine and of his apprehension of the place of the Holy Spirit, does not estimate the Cappadocians at their full value. The word "pluralism" has too great an attraction for him as a word of interpretation. The Cappadocian theology has its great worth in preserving the idea of Divine personal relations, whereas in Augustine the reality of such relations may at times seem to be threatened by the overwhelming sense of the Divine unity. Orthodoxy needs both the Cappadocians and Augustine. It is only fair, in taking leave of Mr. Green, to point out the difficulty of arriving at one agreed account of the progress of dogma and of the positions of early schools and individual theologians. Mr. Green can and does produce much good evidence in support of the positions he takes up; it is in regard to the relation of that evidence to other evidence that there is ground for disagreement. the expression keeper with the relation of the flower to

III

Of the three remaining and more speculative essays two are by Mr. Brabant. The brief discussion of "Augustine and Plotinus" is the more valuable because there is so little in English to which an enquirer on this important subject can be referred. Mr. Brabant has a timely defence of the formula of creation ex nihilo, a formula which would be objectionable if nihil were construed positively. "Is there," he asks, "any other form of words which protects us better against Pantheism and Acosmism? It expresses, more firmly than Plotinus succeeded in expressing it, the doctrine that all things are from God, and yet that they are not God, nor do they help to make up God."

Mr. Brabant's second article is on "God and Time." He begins with a clear and valuable statement of the different attitudes towards times adopted in modern philosophy, making

a broad division between "Progressism" and "Monism," and pointing out the difficulties in which each is involved. He seems to me admirable in the criticism he directs at the exaltation of movement and search at the expense of achievement: he rightly refuses to be intimidated by the word "static." But though Mr. Brabant's own sympathies are obviously with monism rather than with progressism, he is far from evading the intellectual difficulties of the former position. On the contrary, these are so patent that "Monism has been almost bound to come to terms with Time." A brief glance at the Hegelian synthesis leads on to a consideration of the consistency of this synthesis with Catholic theology, and finally to the bearing of the doctrine of the Trinity on the problem of time and eternity.

This problem involves the problem of freedom, and Mr. Brabant poses a dilemma. "How can I, as a temporary reflection of an eternal fact, have liberty to differ from the eternal fact of my history already present with God?" But is freedom, then, an illusion? On the other hand, can we think of God as "in any sense eternal-i.e., already perfect and complete "-if He is liable to be surprised by temporal occurrences? We need, I think, to clear out of the way the idea of the relation of the eternal to the temporal as in any sense a temporal relation involving temporal priority. The verb "foreknow" as applied to God is religiously necessary, but philosophically unsatisfactory. To find a phrase suggestive of the true line of approach and able to stand cross-examination is far from easy; but might we not say that God knows events as happening in the temporal order, rather than that He foreknows them before they happen? The event is a real event, a freely chosen fact of the temporal order, only as it occurs, and it is as it occurs that God knows it. But that is not to say that God is ignorant of it "beforehand." To say that is to introduce once again a false relation. In his final section Mr. Brabant discusses the relation of God to the created world in the light of the doctrine of the Trinity. Here we come nearest to his own mind on the time-problem. "The Time-process," he says, "breaks out in the Eternity of God by a voluntary act of self-limitation, of which the relation of the Father to the Son is the eternal counterpart." Again, "God 'becomes' in Time what He is eternally." These pages are an excellent example of sound thought and statement on a subject which does not allow us to attain to a "solution" of its inherent paradoxes and antinomics. And Mr. Brabant makes it clear that the doctrine of the Trinity is a help, not a hindrance.

The final essay is by Professor Leonard Hodgson and has as its title "The Incarnation." In its early pages we come much more in sight of the problem of the relation between God and man, or divine and human nature, than anywhere else in the

book. It seems to me unfortunate that Mr. Hodgson uses the adjective "antipathetic" to describe patristic thought of the difference between the divine ousia and the human. Radically different because of the fact that one is uncreated the other created—so did the Fathers conceive of the matter: but the word "antipathetic" bears an unnecessarily emotional tinge. And Mr. Hodgson admits as true that distinction on which the Fathers laid stress. In the sections on "Manhood" and "Godhead" there is a most useful discussion of the meaning of the self or soul, which begins an argument which leads up to the conclusion that "the manhood of each one of us is imperfectly real, and that the only real manhood is that of the risen and ascended Lord, by union with whom we come to our perfection and so to our own real manhood." In the discussion of the nature of Godhead attention is directed to the problem of passibility. "The question most vital from the point of view of Christology is whether or no the Godhead is capable of suffering." As it stands this is, at least, an over-statement, but it is more defensible than it seems when we find Mr. Hodgson insisting on "limitation rather than pain" as the root-meaning of the word "suffering": "to be passible is to be capable of standing in the 'passive' as contrasted with the 'active' relation, of being worked upon as contrasted with working." So, passing to the Incarnation, Mr. Hodgson would have us think of this "as the entry by One who is divine upon an experience of life under certain conditions—namely, those which are involved in being the subject of experiences mediated through a body in this world of space and time; for to be the. subject of such experiences is to be human." Such a statement is the right kind of "restatement." It makes the essential meaning of the orthodoxy of the past more accessible to modern minds. In the brief survey of the Christological controversies which follows, the justice done to Cyril of Alexandria deserves special recognition. But here a further consideration of the question of impassibility introduces difficulties. Mr. Hodgson thinks that Cyril's Christology was inconsistent with, though better than, his cosmology, and he is determined to take the two problems closely together. For him the problem of creation is concentrated in the problem of Christology. In his final pages we see what that means for him. His suggestion is that "in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ is to be found the key to the problem of creation to that fundamental philosophical problem of the relation of time and eternity, as we see in the union of the two natures in Christ the central moment of history, which sheds its light on all the rest." There is much virtue in the way Professor Hodgson reaches this point, but I am not convinced that in order to be in substantial agreement with him one must see the unity of the problems of creation and incarnation in the way in which he sees it, and, as to creation itself, both to maintain with him "unimpaired the distinction between the finite and the infinite, the temporal and the eternal, the created and the Creator," and also to recognize "the necessity for rational thought of the fundamental unity of the whole." The "inconsistency" of Cyril and Chalcedon in respect of cosmology and Christology may involve us in a more difficult paradox, but it commits us less in that most dangerous region of cosmological speculation and synthesis.

But Mr. Hodgson's essay is a very good example of what I suggested at the beginning of this review, that at vital points the book always comes down on the right side. For here, undoubtedly, is a doctrine of incarnation, refusing to be reduced to one of divine immanence, just as in former essays the doctrine of the Trinity is not transformed into an acknowledgment of three chief attributes or qualities. And whether we judge it by its scholarship or by its religious grasp the book reaches a level of distinction which is the truest reward of the labours

of its authors.

J. K. MOZLEY.

NOTICES

THE DIARY OF JOHN YOUNG, S.T.P.: DEAN OF WINCHESTER 1616 TO THE COMMONWEALTH. Extracts transcribed and Edited by Florence Remington Goodman. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This terse and lively record is a welcome addition to our none too plentiful seventeenth-century evidence bearing particularly upon the economical and social changes already in operation. The Diarist in his capacity as Dean possesses a twofold merit, he took a worthy place among the re-founders of the Cathedral tradition of regular and dignified religious worship, and as chairman of the Chapter he stabilized their

financial and legal status. The finances depended upon the letting of copyholds and the farming of prebendal rectories (glebeland and tithe). The larger copyholds had become valuable and tenants were trying to treat them as their own freeholds, felling timber, quarrying stone, "grubbing up" coppies, and trying to prevent the prebendaries from taking the timber which was, of course, their manorial right. It is clear that the insignificant dues obtainable and the troublesome business of holding courts inclined many of "the company" (as the Dean terms the Chapter) to let such petty business slide, but Young was proof against bluff, stuck to law and evidence, kept his temper and his dignity, and stopped the loss of the Chapter's rights through their own slackness. He will have no more of the long leases "for lives" at a nominal fee, and keeps reminding "my brethren" that the lawyers say now that to satisfy the new law three lives may not cover more than twenty-one years.

His sagacity seems to have been baffled but once, by the mysterious ways of rabbits. "Widow Sutton spoils all other coppices and her own with the conies . . . ther wes of ould but a clapper alowed: [a kind of little fold or large hutch] now the conies goes over all. . . ." It was the greed for free building materials which set the people plundering Church property. The Bishop himself was urged to pull down the chapter-house, and did so. But there are signs of lay animosity. The Mayor of Winton would only go to the Cathedral with his maces upright (a token of authority), and tried to rate the Cathedral with his maces upright (a token of a subsidy, though the Sheriff had already collected their tax. On the other hand, we clearly perceive the direct dependence of Dean and Chapter on the Crown and Archbishop.

The Editor has certainly selected wisely and for the most part has elucidated competently, especially with regard to topography and genealogy. But there ought to be explanation of unusual terms—of "the Church litton," of the tenement called a "Whalbone," and of "the King's skoll" which should be drunk on Berwick bridge. If this means the Norse skoal it is interesting. Nor has an editor any right to thrust aside the whole system of land-holding and courts by a jaunty recommendation to regard them all "from a respectful distance." Yet her introduction forms almost a third of the volume. We could spare some of the genealogies and picturesque descriptions for one page of clear exposition.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

C. Callewaert, J.C.D. Liturgicae Institutiones. Tractatus Primus. De Sacra Liturgia Universum. Editio altera. Pp. viii.+168. Car. Beyaert, Editor Pontificius. Brugis. 1925. 12 fr.

Among the fruits of the Oxford Movement in this country and of the contemporary reawakening of Catholicism in Europe not the least important has been the revival of interest in liturgical matters. In turning to the past and its faith men have naturally been led to the lapidary expression of that faith in liturgies: ecclesia credens takes shape for the future as ecclesia orans. The rediscovery of liturgical forms and of their spirit and meaning is a process which is by no means at an end: the remarkable work since the war of the Verein zur Pflege der Liturgiewissenschaft bears

eloquent testimony to this.

At the same time the ancient material thus brought to light is not easy of access to the tiro, and such an introduction as Father Callewaert's is welcome. It has proved its utility by needing to be reprinted in 1925, after being first issued in 1919. It is a thoroughly practical manual, which passes from a definition of the meaning of liturgy and considerations of the nature and significance of Christian worship to review the history of Western liturgies in a lucid manner and with adequate references to modern authorities: some interesting pages are devoted to the modern revival of liturgical study, and an eloquent tribute is in them paid to English scholarship. In conclusion an interesting survey of the canonical position in liturgical matters is given.

In the new edition which this work deserves and will no doubt attain Eduard Schwartz should be given joint credit with Dom Connolly for the identification of the Church Order of Hippolytus (p. 59 n.); they reached the same result independently. Further parts of the *Institutiones* will be

awaited with interest.

COMPANY TO A STREET OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE P

FROM MOWBRAYS' LIST

MIRRORS OF THE HOLY. Ten Studies in Sanctity.

By LUCY MENZIES, Author of "St. Columba of Iona," "Saints in Italy," etc. With Frontispiece and Four other Plates in Photogravure. 12s. 6d. (Post 6d.)

Studies of the lives and works of ten women distinguished for their sanctity, although not all are canonized saints. They range from St. Hildegard, who lived in the eleventh century, to Elizabeth Leseur, who died in 1914. Extensive quotations from the Saints' own writings are a feature of the book.

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. A Study in Principles. T. A. LACEY, D.D., Canon of Worcester. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (Post 31d.)

Recent events have not only brought the question of Authority in the Church into prominence, but have shown that a good deal of confused thinking exists about it in many quarters. Dr. Lacey's book should do much to remedy this by its clear and acute discussion of principles, avoiding controversial details.

"A little book the importance of which is out of all proportion to its size."-Guardian.

THE GOSPEL AND MODERNISM. By the Rev. A. E. BAKER, Author of "How to Understand Philosophy," etc. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. the DEAN OF YORK. 28. 6d. (Post 2d.) Cloth, 3s. 6d. (Post 3d.)

A penetrating and well-documented criticism of recent Modernist teaching on the Virgin Birth, Miracles, the Atonement, the Church, the Sacraments, and Eternal Life.

THE ANGLICAN TRADITION. A Discussion of Eucharistic Doctrine. By the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Vicar of Bolton; Hon. Canon of Manchester. 28. 6d. (Post 2d.)

"Written with the combination of sobriety of thought and vivacity of statement that his other writings would lead his renders to expect. Few books could be more timely, and few have ever put the true Anglican position better."—Guardian.

BY WAY OF ILLUSTRATION. A Collection of Stories, Illustrations, and Analogies for Preachers. By C. A. AULT. With a Preface by the Rev. P. H. ROGERS, Vicar of St. Mary's, Brookfield. 3s. 6d. (Post 4d.)

"Sometimes," says George Herbert, of the preacher, "he tells them stories and sayings of others, for them also men heed and remember better than exhortation." This collection of such aids to the preacher is not only well chosen, but is so arranged that he can turn at once to the subject he wishes to illustrate.

"This is a really useful book."-Church Times.

GOLD, FRANKINCENSE, AND MYRRH. A Collection of Original Prayers for Various Occasions. By ESME RATCLIFFE. Cloth, 38. 6d. (Post 3d.)

A HANDBOOK OF CHURCH LAW FOR THE CLERGY. By E. J. C. NEEP, Barrister-at-Law, and GEORGE EDINGER, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Cloth, 38. 6d. (Post 3d.)

"Clergymen who wish to find quickly and easily the solution of the many points of law and practice which are continually arising in a parish, will find this book a very satisfactory help. But the interest of the book need not be confined to the clergy. . . ."—The Times Literary Supplement.

INTENTIONS AT THE EUCHARIST, By the Rev. ELWIN MILLARD, M.A., Of the Community of the Resurrection. 18. (Post 1d.)

Acts of thanksgiving, together with petitions for others and for self, for three days of each week, and also for festivals and special days. These are usually suggested by the Collect, Epistle, or Gospel.

CHRISTIAN TEACHING AND THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Subjects for Sermons for Two Years. By the Rev. H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. 9d. (Post rd.)

"We commend this little book with confidence."-Church Times.

IN THE PRESS

SERMON OUTLINES. By MARCUS DONOVAN, Vicar of St. Agnes, Kennington Park. 5s.

Contains 114 outline sermons for the Sundays and principal Holy Days of the Christian year. The Index is so arranged that the preacher can turn immediately to the subject he wishes to deal with.

Mowbrays' Autumn Book List sent post free upon application.

A. R MOWBRAY & CO., LTD., 28, Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, London, W.1; and 9 High Street Oxford.

The new volume by the BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER (President of this year's Church Congress, Cheltenham)

THE BUILDING OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

By A. C. HEADLAM.

7s. 6d. net.

"We have no hesitation in saying that it is many years since there has appeared a volume of sermons so clearly written, so massively learned, and so full of teaching for the present day."—Record.

"In this book one of the most industrious and tenacious minds among the English episcopate may be studied to advantage."—Guardian.

SIMPLICITY TOWARDS CHRIST

By HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS, Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. With a Preface by the Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

In this age of great material progress the author feels that a study of the life and ideals of Christ, and their true interpretation, is more than ever necessary if the essential spiritual elements of our life are to be preserved. His book is alive with modern interest.

68. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

THE FAITH THAT REBELS

A Re-examination of the Miracles of Jesus.

By D. S. CAIRNS, D.D., Principal of U.F.C. College, Aberdeen.

Author of "The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith," etc.

"At last we have a book on miracles which really moves the problem out of the stalemate into which it has fallen."—The Guardian.

A BIBLICAL THOROUGHFARE

An Endeavour to share the Main Results of Bibical Scholarship with the General Public.

By N. S. TALBOT, D.D., Bishop of Pretoria. 7s. 6d. net.

THE GOSPEL OF GOD [In the press.

By HERBERT KELLY, Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham.

4s. net. Paper Covers, 2s. 6d. net.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

An Essay in Pastoral Theology in the Light of Present-day Needs. By Canon T. W. PYM, M.A., D.S.O. Author of "Psychology and the Christian Life," etc. 5s. net.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN PAITH

Selections from the writings of the late Gaston Frommel.

Edited by J. Vernon Bartlet, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

Translated from the French by J. Macantney Wilson, D.D. 7s. 6d. net.

WRITE FOR NEW AUTUMN LIST OF BOOKS

32 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1

A SELECTION FROM

JAMES CLARKE & CO.'S NEW BOOKS

THE CHUROH AND THE HYMN WRITERS. By G. CURRIE MARTIN, M.A., B.D. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, 6s. net. ("THE LIVING CHURCH" SERIES.)

LET US WORSHIP GOD. A Book of Prayers for Divine Service. Prepared by HUBERT L. SIMPSON, M.A., Minister of Westminster Church, London. Large post 8vo., cloth boards, red edges, 4s. 6d. net.

THE INNER CIRCLE. Studies in Christian Thought and Experience. By DONALD DAVIDSON, B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, gilt lettering on back and side, 3s. 6d. net.

WORSHIP. WITNESS AND WORK. Being Notes of Lectures on the Work of the Ministry. By the late ROBERT STEPHENSON SIMPSON, M.A., D.D. With an Introduction by Principal JOHN McKenzie, M.A. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, with Portrait, 3s. net.

CHRIST IN SHAKESPEARE. Addresses on Moral and Spiritual Elements in some of the Greater Plays. By George H. Morrison, D.D. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, 8s. 6d. net.

MEDITATIONS IN ECCLESIAS TIOUS. By ARTHUR F. TAYLOR, M.A. With Foreword by the Very Rev. G. K. A. Bell, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Crown 8vo . cloth boards, 6s. net.

THE WISDOM LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, including the Song of Songs. By W. S. BRUCE, D.D., F.R.S.E., Croall Lecturer for-1904 at Edinburgh University. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, 8s. 6d. net.

THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By J. S. RUTHERFORD, M.A. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, 3s. 6d, net,

WHEN HE DWELT AMONG US. By the Rev. WILFRID S. BROOKES, Missionary of United Free Church of Scotland, Jamaica. Crown 8vo., cloth boards. 3s. net.

OLD TESTAMENT SCENES AND CHARACTERS. By Professor JOHN EDGAR MCFADYEN, D.D., Author of "The Approach to the Old Testament," etc. Crown 8vo., cloth boards, 6s. net. "The author has done a fine piece of work in the arious studies which he here sets before us."—Charch of England Newspaper.

JAMES OLARKE & Oo. Ltd., 9 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.O. 2

Obtainable from all Booksellers.

Full Catalogue will be sent post free on application.

-LONGMANS

FIERY GRAINS

Thoughts and Sayings for Some Occasions put together by H. R. L. SHBPPARD and H. P. MARSHALL.

3s. 6d. net. Best Edition, 7s. 6d. net.

It is a book for EVERYMAN and for his every-day moods and difficulties, his sorrows and his pleasures Fiery Grains seeks to hallow the humdrum life of the ordinary person with appropriate and encouraging sayings taken from the widest and most divergent sources.

THE SHINING MYSTERY OF JESUS

Rev. DOUGLAS EDWARDS, M.A. With an Introduction by the Rt. Rev. WILLIAM TEMPLE, 6s, net.

ESSAYS ON THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION By MEMBERS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. Editor: Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D. 218, net.

THE INCARNATE LORD

An Essay concerning the Doctrine of the Incarnation in its Relation to Organic Conceptions Rev. LIONEL S. THORNTON, M.A. 218, net.

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO-DAY

A Handbook of Evangelistic Missions for Missioners and Parochial Clergy

CANON PETER GREEN, M.A. Paper covers, 29. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. net.

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ,

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

A One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause, will be published this year.

The Second Edition of "The Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice" (S.P.C.K., 2d.) is now ready.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be oppressed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership: Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows: Full Members, 10/- a year; Associates, 2/6; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.